

THE

# SATURDAY REVIEW

OF

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 839, Vol. 32.

November 25, 1871.

[Registered for  
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

## IRISH DISAFFECTION.

IF it were permissible to criticize Irish patriots, it might perhaps be suggested that they are difficult to please. The dissatisfaction which was expressed at the result of the late trial in Dublin, although it may perhaps indirectly have affected the character of the jury, was primarily caused by the apparent triumph of Mr. BUTT's legal arguments, and of the moral theories propounded to a sympathetic populace by the *Irishman* and other nationalist papers. The verdict, whatever may have been the reasons on which it was founded, seemed casually to coincide with propositions which, as Mr. GLADSTONE says of Mr. BRADLAUGH's theological opinions, are at least questionable. The instructors of the multitude openly proclaimed that it is lawful to put an alleged spy to death; and the counsel for the prisoner pledged his professional reputation to the doctrine that the surgeon who failed to cure a wound deliberately inflicted by an assassin was exclusively responsible for the homicide. To the ordinary English mind ethical novelties have a startling or paradoxical appearance; and it was too readily assumed that the jury which acquitted the prisoner must have in some degree accepted the defence which was exclusively advanced on his behalf by his retained and voluntary defenders. As neither the *Irishman* nor Mr. BUTT intimated any serious doubt as to the identity of the assassin, it was not supposed that the jury had by their own unaided sagacity discovered a weak point in the evidence; yet there is little doubt that Mr. MAGUIRE is right in claiming for them the credit of an honest desire to discharge their duty. The Judges and the prosecuting counsel had displayed lamentable weakness; and of the defence it can only be said that it was audacious enough to perplex a timid tribunal. The respectable citizens who were called upon to face a popular clamour, and perhaps to incur personal danger, seem to have decided the case on an issue which, although it was highly material, had been almost overlooked by the counsel and by the Bench. It was necessary to prove that the prisoner was the perpetrator of the crime, although the mob, which regarded him as a hero and possible martyr, would have resented any doubt of his claim to the honour of the exploit. Mr. BUTT perhaps unjustly attributed to the jury the ferocity of the rabble, and thought it was safer to rely on their presumed sympathy with crime than to profit by a defect in the case established for the prosecution. When he afterwards assured the mob that he had gained a great constitutional victory, he must have meant something more than the assertion that the verdict was in accordance with the evidence. Under an imaginary Irish Constitution it would probably be lawful to murder detective officers; but no known Constitution includes a special provision that proof of guilt ought to precede conviction. So much of the blame of any miscarriage of justice rests on the Judges and on the counsel, that the jury may be excused for having satisfied themselves, even by irregular methods, that the proof of identity was insufficient. Yet Mr. MAGUIRE is a little unreasonable when he blames English speakers or writers for their error in interpreting the verdict by the conduct of the case. It is perfectly true that in many political trials Dublin juries have shown both uprightness and courage; and it is possible that some of their members may have been disappointed by the impunity afterwards extended to criminals whom they had at their own risk brought to justice. All who wish to promote social or political improvement in Ireland will be anxious to place the most favourable construction on the conduct of all who are charged with the administration of justice. If the traders of Dublin really held the doctrines of the *Irishman*, the prospects of Ireland would be almost hopeless. It is not altogether

unsatisfactory that the habitual assailants of English rule should exhibit a morbid susceptibility to English opinion. As long as any principles are acknowledged in common it is always imaginable that a controversy may admit of a solution. With Mr. BUTT's theories about the respective liabilities of assassins and hospital surgeons it is impossible to deal.

It is useless to disguise the embarrassments which are caused by the chronic disaffection of Ireland. Mr. BUTT's revival of the agitation for Repeal threatens to be as troublesome as O'CONNELL's, except that it is not as heartily supported by the priests. The promoters of the movement announce that at the next election they will return eighty members pledged to Home Rule, and it is certain that the strength of the faction in the House of Commons will be largely increased. The Fenians will not fail to profit by the invention of a theory of separation which is not openly treasonable. It may be doubted whether there are half-a-dozen politicians in Ireland who think it either possible or desirable to restore the old Irish Parliament, or to combine a revival of that institution with a second representation for Imperial purposes; but Mr. BUTT has the advantage of propounding theories which are not ostensibly illegal, while the professed enemies of England well know that in supporting Home Rule they are advocating the disruption of the Empire. Nothing can be idler than the attempt to turn the Irish difficulty into the party purpose of opposition to the Government. It may be true that Mr. GLADSTONE's great Irish measures have, up to the present time, neither removed discontent nor checked seditious language; but it ought to be remembered that the Imperial Government is stronger since it has relieved itself of the incumbrance of the Irish Establishment; and it is inconceivable that the occupiers of the land should be more inclined to rebellion since they have become the virtual owners of their holdings. Any English Government, whether it is called Liberal or Conservative, will be equally compelled to enforce exceptional laws in disturbed districts, and it will be equally unable to accelerate the amelioration which may be faintly expected in the future. It is happily improbable that the real or supposed interest of any Ministry can tempt it to tamper with the assertion of Imperial authority. Mr. GLADSTONE himself, while he regards English agitation against the Crown as a harmless eccentricity, has for once spoken strongly on the inadmissible character of the Irish demand for Home Rule or independence.

Even if Mr. GLADSTONE and Mr. FORTESCUE were not sincerely sanguine in their view of Irish affairs, no language could be more politic than their expression of a confident belief in the success of recent legislation. Statistical proofs of the material prosperity of Ireland, such as those adduced by Mr. FORTESCUE, and more recently by Mr. Justice LAWSON, are both conclusive for their immediate purpose and encouraging to the supporters of peace and order. The occupation of making and saving money is too pleasant to be willingly exchanged for patriotic enterprises in the nature of civil war and rebellion. The agitation for Home Rule has for the most part been confined to the towns, and though farmers may, in accordance with ancient custom, be willing to listen to seditious speeches, they are not prepared to join in the insurrection which alone could render Repeal possible. The chief use of rose-coloured visions of the future is that they provide a plausible excuse for resting and waiting. It may be doubted whether the Government will find time in the next Session for dealing with the vexed question of Irish education. The more zealous English Liberals are naturally shocked at some of the pretensions of the Irish bishops, which are, as on former occasions, advanced in a form which seems to have been deliberately adopted for the purpose of challenging opposition; but the Government, although its members may admit the justice of the objections which

are raised, has also to consider how much the priesthood can do to promote or impede the establishment of peace and order. It may not be desirable to concede the demands of the Roman Catholic clergy, and it will be scarcely possible to escape discussion of the subject; but, so far as serious action is concerned, there are such contrivances as adjournment and evasion. Mr. BUTT has, as might have been expected, tendered his adhesion to the Ultramontane claims, on condition that his projects are supported by the hierarchy. Mr. FORTESCUE's vague and yet significant phrases will be regarded as a counter bid for support on behalf of the Government; and for the present all parties, except Mr. FAWCETT and his more eager friends, would probably prefer to leave the question in abeyance. When it becomes necessary to arrive at a decision, the remonstrances of the Northern Presbyterians must be taken into consideration as well as the pretensions of the priesthood and the scruples of the English Liberals. The grievance of a few young Irish Catholics of the upper classes who require an improved University education, however serious, is not absolutely intolerable. Until Mr. GLADSTONE has made up his mind as to the third branch of the Upas-tree, and the best mode of cutting it off, they may go to Trinity College, or to the Queen's Colleges, or they may take degrees at any English or Scotch University, or they may indulge their orthodox propensities by frequenting the so-called Catholic University of Dublin. It is more immediately urgent that Ireland should be quiet, and that the law should be enforced, than that all theoretical anomalies should be summarily abolished.

#### THE PLYMOUTH ELECTION.

THE election of a Conservative to replace Sir R. COLLIER at Plymouth is an event of some importance. Taken in conjunction with the East Surrey election, it shows that the Government has lost ground with the constituencies. How much ground it has lost no one can pretend to judge; but there is nothing like the fervour and enthusiasm in its favour which ran through the English boroughs three years ago, and wafted Mr. GLADSTONE into power with a majority of more than a hundred. Mr. GLADSTONE at Whitby insisted with his usual vehemence of assertion that, although the Ministry had been severely criticized, the sphere of adverse opinion was confined to London circles and London clubs, and that the fidelity of the provincial constituencies was unshaken. We do not see how it is possible to contend that this is so now. The Truro election showed nothing, for the Liberal party split up, and a Conservative took advantage of the division. But in East Surrey, and now again at Plymouth, a Conservative has got in because the Liberal electors largely abstained from voting. Mr. ROOKER, the defeated Liberal candidate, polled 547 fewer than Sir ROBERT COLLIER, and 526 fewer than Mr. MORRISON polled in 1868. This means that one Liberal in four abstained from voting. There were, indeed, other than political causes at work; but they seem to have told about as much for and against one side as the other. It may be difficult to feel much enthusiasm for a local Dissenting solicitor, but it is equally difficult to care much about a stranger and a shipowner. The support of the great beer interest was given to the Conservative; but Mr. ROOKER appears to have looked before he leapt, and to have thought the support of the friends of the Permissive Bill better worth securing. The Liberal party had, too, on this occasion an advantage which they had not in East Surrey. As their candidate was a Nonconformist, they were safe from any manifestation of that vengeance which the Nonconformists hint they may wreak at any moment on account of the disappointment the Education Act has been to them. The only special disadvantages under which the Liberals found themselves at Plymouth were that the blunders and misfortunes of the Admiralty may have produced a more than ordinary effect among a population specially able to appreciate them, and that the dockyard labourers may have been persuaded that the Conservatives are likely to spend more money when in power than their opponents. Mr. BATES, who has now been returned, polled upwards of two hundred more than the Conservative candidate polled in 1868, and this may perhaps be accounted for by the support derived from grievances against the Admiralty. But if the Liberals who came forward three years ago had come forward with equal readiness and promptitude now, their candidate would, in spite of the improved position of the Conservative candidate, have won by a large majority. The question therefore which the Ministry have to ask themselves is, how it happens that, in a constituency of indisputable

importance, one friend of the Government out of every four has been willing to see a seat lost rather than take the slight trouble of voting for the Ministerial candidate?

Different answers to this question may of course be given; for it is probably a combination of causes rather than any one paramount cause that has led to the result. There is an inevitable reaction, a natural weariness and decay of zeal, after great questions have been settled by an extraordinary effort. All politics look a little tame now after the excitement of the disestablishment of the Irish Church. The Liberal majority, too, has been, and is, so large that it seems to the Liberals of any one locality as if it made no great difference whether a single seat is lost or kept. The moderate portion of the Liberal party may also be somewhat frightened and scandalized by recent Radical utterances, and may think it better to wait and look about them before they send Mr. GLADSTONE another supporter. But we do not think that these larger and more general causes have been the most operative. The electors of Plymouth appear to have scarcely troubled themselves about general politics at all. Both sides supported the Ballot. Neither side cared much about the abolition of purchase or the position of the House of Lords, or even the Education question. The total disappearance of the Ballot out of it, may almost be said, the memory of the public, is one of the most curious phenomena of modern politics. This great measure, to which everything last year had to give way, and which is to be the first occupation of the Ministry next Session, excites so little enthusiasm and so little respect in the constituencies that no one ever mentions it. But as there is not much interest felt at the moment by the Liberal party generally in great questions, there is of course a stronger inclination to think of and to attach importance to minor questions. That the Ministry made such a muddle and mess of everything last Session that it is really not worth caring very much about, is the tacit thought of many Liberals who are perhaps inclined, for social reasons, to take any easy opportunity of abstaining from giving offence to Conservative customers or friends. Two blunders of the Ministry have specially contributed, we imagine, to strengthen this feeling of indifference to their cause. The payers of Income-tax cannot quite forget that they have had a heavy burden put on them by a Minister who himself announced that to put such a burden on them was most unjust, and the annoyance of the Income-tax has been greatly augmented this year by the State having adopted the plan of enormously surcharging those assessed, and leaving each taxpayer to get out of the scrape as he best may. The unhappy Licensing Bill of the unhappy HOME SECRETARY is also always turning up to confront and discomfit the Ministry. The SOLICITOR-GENERAL at Dover has even found himself obliged to go so far as to claim credit for the Liberal party because they made Mr. BRUCE withdraw it. What a Bill it must have been when a Government official thinks the best way to recommend himself to his supporters in the constituency he represents is to proclaim that he and all the real friends of the Government at once knocked it on the head! A Bill prepared without thought, defended without courage, and withdrawn without dignity, although it dealt with a subject appealing to the pocket, the pleasures, or the prejudices of almost every elector, makes a landmark in the memory of constituencies, and is apt to produce bad consequences disproportionate perhaps to the occasion that has given rise to them.

The Ministry has, however, its fate in its own hands. It has still an enormous majority, and the country, we believe, still remains of opinion that in times of some danger and much dangerous talk the safest thing is to persevere in sound and carefully considered measures of Reform. There is no one among the Conservative leaders holding anything like the same position in the eyes of the nation which Sir ROBERT PEEL held in the last days of the MELBOURNE Ministry. There is no Conservative leader who offers to the consideration of the nation anything better than the utterances of decent common sense or wearisome platitudes. Experience has shown over and over again that Conservatives, if in office without a majority in the House of Commons, cease to be Conservatives. Their existence depends on their dishing the Whigs. They are like white traders fallen into the hands of savages, who have to bring out one string of bright beads after another in order to avoid or delay being eaten. It can hardly be from such a state of things that the newly found treasure, the Conservative working-man, is acquiring such an interest in the study of the Constitution. Not even the most sanguine Conservative could profess to believe that, if there were a dissolution now, the majority of a new House of Commons would support a Conservative



Ministry. It must consequently be as much the interest of the Conservatives as of their opponents to let the present Ministry hold on for a time undisturbed. The Government therefore is likely to have a fair opportunity of doing what may be necessary to rouse the Liberal party from its apathy. What it needs is the air and reputation of being successful. Nothing succeeds like success, and the Liberals will be in spirits enough to come to the poll if a well conducted Session next year blots out the damping thoughts of the *Megara*, and the Income-tax, and Mr. BRUCE. The reappearance of Mr. BRIGTH and Mr. CHILDERS in the House will give new strength to the party to which they belong, and possibly some reflected credit to the Ministry. They know, too, the subjects with which they must deal, and have plenty of time to prepare for dealing with them. Still no one can feel at all sure that Mr. GLADSTONE will get through next Session, for he loves to astonish the world by creating, in sheer wantonness, difficulties that become formidable from his manner both of creating and opposing them. The appointment of Sir ROBERT COLLIER, for example, to a seat in the Judicial Committee, in which it is said Mr. GLADSTONE intends to persevere, is an act which the Liberal majority may find itself obliged to condone and in name to sanction, but which it will be impossible to defend on its merits. This is an embarrassment which Mr. GLADSTONE has created for his supporters without the slightest shadow of reason; and it is impossible to say that any Government is stable which is constantly exposed to sudden catastrophes from the indiscretion of its leaders.

#### THE CRISIS IN AUSTRIA.

COUNT BEUST has informed the diplomatic agents of Austria that his dismissal was effected in the most gracious manner; and he expresses an ambiguous hope that his successor may at some future time retire from office with as much satisfaction as himself. The well-known Hungarian Correspondent of the *Times* may perhaps be influenced by a pardonable bias in his belief that Count ANDRASSY will prove an abler and firmer Minister than Count BEUST. As the chief representative in the Hungarian Government of the moderate or DEAK party, Count ANDRASSY has given proof of his capacity by the good understanding which he has helped to maintain between the Eastern and Western Delegations, and between the constituencies which they represent. It is possible that he may for the moment be less obnoxious to the Czechs than his German predecessor; but, on the other hand, a Hungarian statesman will probably be regarded as an intruder in a controversy which ostensibly concerns only the Western half of the monarchy. It is difficult consistently to respect the limitations of a new and complicated Constitution. The Chancellor and Foreign Minister is expressly restrained by the terms of his appointment from any interference in the domestic affairs of either Austria or Hungary; but, even if external relations were not intimately connected with the relations between the different provinces and races of the Empire, it would be practically impossible for the chief adviser of the Crown to remain absolutely neutral in a vital controversy. Fifteen or sixteen years ago some noble wiseacre indignantly asked the Prime Minister in the House of Lords whether the alarming report that Prince ALBERT habitually advised the QUEEN on matters of State was founded on fact. Lord ABERDEEN replied that the rumour was perfectly true; and he added his opinion that it would be impossible, if it had been desirable, to disturb the most natural of arrangements. The obvious good sense of the answer summarily and finally abated a clamour which had for some time previously been raised by the sillier classes of the community. The Chancellor of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy is not a Prince Consort, but he can scarcely be prevented from using his influence and authority for the promotion of the general welfare.

Count BEUST was perhaps not sufficiently careful to efface himself in matters of domestic policy; but the remonstrances which were provoked by his alleged partisanship would have been more properly directed against the constitutional provisions which he may perhaps have infringed; and he incurred the resentment of the Slavonic malcontents by an apparent desertion of their cause. Notwithstanding his German predilections, Count BEUST, like Mr. LINCOLN in somewhat similar circumstances, was willing to preserve the unity of Austria by either of two opposite methods. As the PRESIDENT would have legalized or would have abolished slavery for the sake of the Union, Count BEUST would have allied himself either with the Czechs or the Germans for the purpose of making the Constitution work. A year or two ago he offended his

Austrian colleagues by accompanying the EMPEROR to Prague, and by entering into negotiations with the Bohemian leaders. His subsequent conviction of the necessity of maintaining friendly relations with the German Empire, although it may excuse and justify his adhesion to the German party, can scarcely have satisfied the Czechs. It is probable that he might nevertheless have maintained himself in power but for the hostility which he had accumulated upon himself as a stranger, a Protestant, and a Liberal politician. The EMPEROR perhaps thought that the dismissal of Count BEUST would tend to break up the anomalous coalition of nobles, of bishops, and of Slavonic Democrats. The great families, even where they are called by Bohemian names and titles, have for many generations become practically German; and it is only for a special purpose that they can be induced to countenance new-fangled pretensions founded on ethnological arguments. The more intelligent part of the clergy must foresee in the increase of Russian influence a more serious danger than the repeal or neglect of an impracticable Concordat. If the fall of Count BEUST tends to reconcile the clergy and the aristocracy to the Constitution, the personal injustice which he may have suffered might be overlooked in regard of the public advantages which it would have produced. Notwithstanding the ill-judged antagonism of the Ultramontane party to the German Empire, no statesman can doubt that the safety and the unity of Austria require a cordial understanding with Germany. The alliance affords the best security both against Russian aggression and against the dismemberment of the Empire.

In the prosecution of the same policy Count ANDRASSY will have some advantages over Count BEUST. The former Saxon Minister relied for support in his adopted country on political sympathy, and on the confidence which might be inspired by his honesty and ability; but in the course of five years he had occasion to try various experiments, nor was it always easy to foresee his ultimate decision. He was at one time, justly or unjustly, accused of favouring a French alliance; nor was it until the superiority of the German arms had been completely asserted that he definitively admitted the necessity of siding with the combatant who had proved to be the stronger. Count ANDRASSY represents a party and a nation, and consequently his general system of policy may be confidently anticipated. The Hungarians are naturally allied with the Austrian Germans, because they also are menaced by Russia, and also because they have more than one Bohemia of their own. The unity of the Kingdom has not of late been seriously threatened, but the concession of the demands which had obtained the approval of Count HOHENWART would have been immediately followed by a similar agitation among the dependencies of the Hungarian Crown. With the new German Empire the Hungarians have a double ground of sympathy, both because Germany is a powerful ally, and because the events of 1866 were the immediate occasion of the acknowledgment of the claims of Hungary. As long as Austria contended with Prussia for supremacy in the German Confederation, the Government of Vienna thought it possible to dispense with the hearty support of Hungary. The compact which was negotiated between Count BEUST and the leading Hungarian statesmen is still new and comparatively untried. The victory of France, especially if it had been facilitated by an Austrian alliance, might not improbably have disturbed the relations which have lately existed between the two great divisions of the Empire. It seems that KOSSUTH, who has lately given an additional proof of his wisdom by joining the International Association, has expressed an opinion that the claims of the Czechs are well founded, and that the successful protest of BEUST and ANDRASSY was consequently a mistake; but an exiled patriot who has degenerated into a demagogue almost always prefers the triumph of his faction to the interests of his country. The Hungarians may differ among themselves on many questions, and even on the continuance of the union with Austria; but with respect to extreme Slavonic pretensions and to the German alliance they are virtually unanimous.

Although the appointment of Count ANDRASSY will have been satisfactory to the adherents of Count BEUST's later policy, the difficulties by which the EMPEROR is surrounded are not perceptibly diminished. It appears that Baron KELLERSPERG, though possessing a reputation for ability and uprightness, has been unable to form a Ministry; and it remains to be seen how far the opinions of Count AUERSPERG will agree with those of the new Chancellor. There seems to be some ground for the belief that Count ANDRASSY is, with the approval of the EMPEROR, disposed to enter into a compromise with the Bohemian Diet. As a Hungarian he has a strong interest in

preventing an alliance between the Czechs and the Slavonic subjects of Hungary; and perhaps he may be sufficiently trusted by his own countrymen and by the Germans to have the power of making considerable concessions. Yet, although the Chancellor of the Monarchy may give the EMPEROR confidential advice, all negotiations with the various provinces must, at least ostensibly, be conducted by the Austrian Prime Minister. It will be extremely difficult to effect the preliminary object of bringing together the Council of the Realm. In some of the States the provincial Assemblies have not been able to secure a quorum, and several of them have hitherto abstained from electing Deputies to the Imperial Parliament. The Bohemian Diet will probably send representatives to Vienna, but its own competence is seriously disputed by the German minority, on the ground of its professed intention to disregard the existing Constitution. There is reason to hope that the Galician Poles will recognise the blunder which they have committed in pretending to rights which were inconsistent with the unity of the Empire; but Bohemia is still averse to reconciliation, and some even of the German provinces are discontented. The internal harmony which apparently prevails in Hungary illustrates the inestimable advantages of historical rights and institutions. Within the Kingdom political parties have long been accustomed to act together; and the concessions of 1867 only restored the natural and familiar state of affairs. In the Western part of the Empire the Constitution was an ingenious experiment which has not up to this time succeeded. The intrinsic merits of the scheme add to the general discouragement, inasmuch as it seems impossible to devise a more hopeful arrangement.

#### GERMAN DIPLOMATISTS.

**A**MONG the items in the Federal Budget which have given rise to discussion in the Reichstag is an estimate for increased salaries to German diplomatists. Everything in Germany has long been managed in the most frugal manner, and no people have more sedulously set the example of looking well after their pence than the Sovereigns of the House of HOHENZOLLERN. It was therefore in accordance with the traditions of the nation, and of the family of the EMPEROR, that a Radical Deputy objected to this increase, and quoted a story of the great FREDERICK, who, when one of his Ministers at a Foreign Court applied for money to enable him to keep a carriage, told him to go on foot and say that he had a hundred thousand soldiers at his back. This was exactly an occasion for Prince BISMARCK to come out with his strong sense, his playful treatment of great questions, and his love of showing that, in every department of State, he acts on a well-reasoned theory. In reply to the economical Deputy, he gave his general views as to the proper position and duties of diplomatists. He frankly avowed that he hoped that this anecdote of the Great FREDERICK might henceforth be allowed to slumber in the grave of general history. What, he said, would in the present day be thought of a diplomatist who informed a brother diplomatist that he could not ask him to dinner, but that his master always kept a hundred thousand troops ready? Prince BISMARCK did not answer the question, but even a Radical Deputy full of reminiscences of the thrifty bully who made Prussia great must have been aware that the diplomatist who answered in such a manner would be generally thought equally insolent and mean. What Prince BISMARCK asks is simply that the representatives of the Empire at foreign Courts should not represent the Empire unworthily, and that they should not add to the personal vexation of doing things shabbily the painful thought that the reflection of their involuntary shabbiness fell on the great nation that had sent them to act and speak in its name. After all, the diplomatists, as their candid friend explained, would not dine particularly well. Their salaries by the side of those allowed by England and Russia and France will still be moderate. Prince BISMARCK does not believe in any diplomatic results from diplomatic dinners. The day for such things is, he says, past, although it may be observed that the Parisians recently believed that M. POUYER-QUERTIER got on so well with Prince BISMARCK himself simply because he was such a large man, and eat and drank so freely, and that it was by these simple and charming arts he succeeded in coaxing Prince BISMARCK into according France concessions, like that by which Germany made France pay for the German soldiers going home before their time, without the slightest diminution of the territorial security for the indemnity. But Prince BISMARCK is too sceptical to put much faith in diplomatic stratagems

of this sort. He wishes German diplomatists to be able to give decently good dinners, because not to give such dinners would be a discredit to Germany. In some countries, where education is advanced, he admitted, as though anxious to show that he had thought everything out, the natives might recollect the greatness of Germany even though they saw the German Minister dining off a mutton-chop. In England, which he was polite enough to speak of as an educated country, and in the United States, people would perhaps be intelligent enough to remember that the present master of German Ministers can march where he pleases with a million of men behind him; but in more backward countries, of which he was too cautious to give examples, men must see before their eyes in the dinners and equipages of German Ministers some embodiment of the greatness of Germany, or they would make the mistake, embarrassing to themselves and fatal to Germany, of having to be otherwise reminded how powerful Germany is.

German diplomatists are thus for the future to be able to avoid mutton-chops and cabs, and to go about with such state and come home to such tables as will do justice to the dignity of their country. And a great number of them are to be Ambassadors, not because it sounds finer, as Prince BISMARCK carefully explained, to have an Ambassador than an Envoy, nor because Ambassadors, according to what he pronounced a vulgar error, have a peculiar right of personal access to the Sovereign to whom they are accredited, but because, according to diplomatic usage, an Ambassador is more quickly and certainly attended to than an Envoy. If an Ambassador calls on a Minister of Foreign Affairs while an Envoy is talking to him, the Envoy is immediately bowed out and the Ambassador is invited to come in. It does not, as Prince BISMARCK reasonably thinks, comport with the dignity of Germany that its representative should be liable to have the door shown him in this way, although the money, he avowed, seemed to him better than the rank, and he would prefer an Envoy with a private fortune to an Ambassador without a private fortune and with an insufficient public salary. Pay the diplomatists enough, was his previous advice, and then if you pay them enough, call them Ambassadors whenever it is found convenient to do so. A handsome sum must, therefore, he explained to his audience, be voted for the Diplomatic Service, and, he added, to sweep away all illusions, this handsome sum must be looked on as permanently needed. It seems cheap to the thoughtless to avoid having a costly Diplomatic Service always going on, and to send out special Ministers when anything particular happens. The difficulties of America and England were all settled, some reflective German might have whispered to himself, in a few weeks by men who were not diplomatists at all. This is true, but the arrangement with America lay altogether out of the region of diplomacy, as it consisted in a party of unprofessional Englishmen being sent out to give up all the points for which English diplomatists had been contending. No one pretends that diplomacy or diplomatists are needed for an errand of this sort. But Germany is not the nation, and Prince BISMARCK is not the man, to court safety in this simple way. If any harm is being anywhere meditated against Germany, he wishes to be warned of it in time, and to stop it; if any opening of advantage to Germany anywhere presents itself, he wishes to be certain not to miss the opportunity. And, further, he must have men whom he can trust and establish permanently at the chief centres of European politics. A new Sovereign or a new Minister may, as he points out, suddenly arise in a foreign country and initiate a new foreign policy, with the scope and intent of which it is of the highest importance that Germany should be acquainted; but no one except a German Minister long resident in that country, knowing its past history, its dangers and its aims, could possibly understand what the new policy was, and how far it affected German interests. A new comer, a German diplomatist sent suddenly to the scene of action, would be completely dazed and bewildered; he would be unable to check the information he received; he would either do nothing and find out nothing, or be at the mercy of deceivers and adventurers, and a dangerous alliance might be overlooked, or a profitable alliance rejected, while he was trying to make himself acquainted with the rudiments of his business.

Every German would at once see that this was undeniably true of Russia and Austria now, and of France hereafter. It would be the extreme of folly were Germany not to spend the requisite amount of money to get knowledge of what is going on, and is likely to be going on, at St. Petersburg and Vienna. France can scarcely be said to be in the diplomatic world now, as all her energies are absorbed in getting money enough



to buy her conquerors off her soil. But in a short time she will be once more an independent, and possibly a dangerous and explosive, Power; and if any political information would be important to Germany, it would be to know whether France really means to run her head against the walls of Metz and Strasburg, and, if so, what preparations for so serious an enterprise she is practically making. But it is impossible to judge of the policy of Russia, Austria, and France without knowing what is going on in England, Italy, and Constantinople. How can Russia be said to have any policy that can affect Germany apart from the policy that she chooses to pursue towards England and Turkey? Then we may easily go a step further. If Russia were to think of quarrelling with Germany, one of her main reasons would be the wish to secure the control of the Baltic, and to secure this she would naturally make overtures to Sweden and Denmark. It is therefore almost as necessary for Prince BISMARCK to know whether all is quiet and trustworthy at Stockholm and Copenhagen as to know that no danger seems impending from St. Petersburg. Thus there are very few States where Germany cares to be represented at all in which she does not need to be served well and permanently. The Deputy who objected to the increase of diplomatic salaries also hinted that a representative of the Court of the Vatican would be needless when there was an Ambassador at Rome accredited to the King of ITALY. Prince BISMARCK does not appear to have gone further into the question thus suggested than of replying that at present the King of ITALY was not at Rome. But every one knows that at this moment there is no Court with the proceedings of which the German CHANCELLOR needs to be more intimately acquainted than that of Rome. The party dominant at Rome has set itself in open opposition to the German Empire, and Prince BISMARCK is far too cautious and too experienced not to keep as watchful an eye as possible on every step that his enemies take to do him harm.

#### SIR CHARLES DILKE AT LEEDS.

IT is not improbable that Sir CHARLES DILKE, in continuing his tour of revolutionary agitation, is rendering an unconscious and unintentional service to the Constitution which he attacks. He has proclaimed himself a Republican, and his fellow-Republicans are delighted at the opportunity of rallying round a baronet, whose temporary or nominal leadership will be readily accepted for the sake of the material contributions to the support of the propaganda which are apparently expected from his liberality. The necessities of the cause are illustrated by the statement that one of its chief organs has been reduced to the raffle of a blanket to provide the means of prolonging its existence; but its adherents may perhaps derive some consolation from the reflection that the commercial failure of BLANQUI's newspaper did not prevent the atrocities of the Commune. It may be assumed that there are a number of people throughout the country who have persuaded themselves, or who are willing to be persuaded, that a Republican form of government would somehow or other be of personal advantage to them, and it is just as well that they should come forth and let us see what kind of people they are, and what it is they are bent upon obtaining. Since he delivered his lecture at Newcastle, Sir CHARLES DILKE has been invited to become an honorary member of the International Association. He has also received the public thanks of the patriots of the "Hole in the Wall," and a vote of confidence from a "Universal Republican League," which seems to meet somewhere in the slums of Vauxhall. Undeterred by these ominous civilities, he has repeated the expression of his views at Bristol and at Leeds. It is not surprising that the revolutionary virulence which has attracted the Internationalists should have had a contrary effect on persons of less advanced opinions. The Chairman of the Bristol Liberal Association, who is understood to be an earnest and energetic Liberal, and who was to have presided at Sir C. DILKE's meeting, refused to have anything to do with it; and even Alderman CARTER deemed it necessary to exact a pledge from the lecturer that at Leeds nothing should be said disrespectful to the Crown. Sir CHARLES has not retracted anything which he said in his address at Newcastle, but he complains that its purport has been misconstrued. He intimates that some of the more offensive passages of the address were quotations from an anonymous pamphlet, and that he did not adopt them as his own, although they have been generally ascribed to him. The marks of quotation which are sufficiently conspicuous and explicit in printed matter are apt to be overlooked in oratory, and it is possible that it requires a more

accomplished elocutionist than Sir CHARLES to convey distinctly and unmistakably to an audience that he is quoting from another person's writings, and not speaking for himself. Even, however, if he had spoken so as to leave no room for misconception on this point, his excuse does not help him much; indeed, it rather magnifies than extenuates his offence. If he had made the statements, which he now says he borrowed, on his own responsibility, it might at least have been pleaded that, if they were inaccurate, it was because he had blundered in his researches. But it is now known that there was no mistake, that he merely caught at certain random assertions in an anonymous pamphlet because they happened to suit his purpose, and that, apparently indifferent to their truth or falsehood, he presented them to an ignorant and excited company of working-men as materials for reflection, at the same time assuring them that they were shamefully ill-used and plundered under the Monarchy, and that a Republic would set everything right. It is not perhaps surprising that the audience should have concluded that so confident a judgment must be based on incontrovertible facts.

It is not permissible for public men who undertake to instruct the people on important constitutional questions to circulate, without examination or inquiry, statements which it is in their power to verify; and still less to make such statements the basis of serious accusations, which, though professedly hypothetical, are almost certain to be received as positive and substantial. "I did not say," Sir CHARLES explains, "that there had been a malversation of public money. I only said that somebody else had said so, and that it required an answer." It must be obvious to any unprejudiced person that, if he believed this charge to be true, his duty as a member of Parliament rendered it obligatory on him to demand an answer from the Government in the House of Commons, and that his right, not only to ask questions, but to move for returns or for a Committee of inquiry, supplied him with ample means of ascertaining exactly how matters stood. On the other hand, it is perhaps needless to say that, if he did not believe the charges to which he gave currency, he should not have repeated them. It is quite certain that he could not expect to obtain any information from the audience to whom he appealed. When challenged on another point by Mr. MANNING, the Coroner of the Royal Household, whose employment, in the opinion of one of Sir CHARLES's admirers, is unhappily too limited, the lecturer had again to acknowledge that he had borrowed his information at second hand, without having taken any trouble to verify it for himself. He had said that, notwithstanding Sir R. PEEL's pledge in 1842, the QUEEN had never paid Income-tax, and he refers, as his authority for this statement, to one of the tracts of the Financial Reform Association. Mr. MANNING is able to state that this is a mistake, and that HER MAJESTY has paid Income-tax from the date of its first imposition to the present time. Mr. MANNING adds an obvious and sufficient explanation of his own office, which applies to other appointments which Sir C. DILKE has attacked. A special Coroner is required for the Royal Household because the residence of the Sovereign is not subject to the ordinary jurisdiction of the Courts of Law.

To attack the QUEEN for arrangements which are actually beyond her control would be, as Sir C. DILKE admits, cruel and unjust, and his assurance that his remarks were not directed against the Sovereign in person will be received with satisfaction. He has also explained that he did not denounce the Monarchy on account of its cost; but the sequence of his observations justified the impression that the expensive retinue of the Court was an argument against the maintenance of a Monarchy. In any case, it is impossible to acquit Sir CHARLES of having used language which, on so serious a subject, was dangerously open to misconception. When a speaker who avows himself a Republican points out with much indignation the abuses of a Monarchy, it is not unreasonable to suppose that he is arguing in favour, not of the repair, but the removal of the Constitution which he detests. A contemporary, who attempts to defend Sir C. DILKE in an article of equivocal meaning, has been curiously misled into a comparison between the agitation of the member for Chelsea on behalf of a Republic and the agitation of Mr. BURKE against the extravagance and excrescences of the Civil List of his day. There are one or two obvious distinctions which the writer strangely overlooks. Mr. BURKE's biographers have failed to discover that he wandered about the country, publishing loose statements, borrowed at second hand from anonymous pamphleteers. His statements were careful and exact, and were accompanied with distinct practical suggestions for the

cure of the evils which he denounced; and he raised the question of the expediency of reducing the Civil List in his place in Parliament, and in the presence of Ministers whom he challenged to correct or contradict his assertions. It should also be observed that his aim was not to promote a pitiful economy in the charges connected with the dignity of the Crown, but to deprive the Crown of the means of corrupting the independence of Parliament by the lavish distribution of sinecures and secret pensions. It was the fact that the King's turnspit and other highly paid menials sat in Parliament, and "oppressed the freedom of Parliamentary deliberations," that constituted the gravamen of his indictment. It is convenient for Sir CHARLES and his friends to assume that the question now at issue is whether the Constitution shall be freely open to discussion. Sir CHARLES's offence consists not in having discussed the Constitution, or in having proclaimed himself a Republican, or in endeavouring to persuade others to share his views, but in addressing to a public meeting complaints which should have been investigated in Parliament, and exciting democratic passions by reckless assertions and insinuations. His arguments in favour of a Republic fall short of the hopes of his supporters. He desires a Republic as the only means of securing a satisfactory system of national education; but it is not certain that the educational system of the United States is much superior to that of Prussia, which is a Monarchy of a type more remote from Republicanism than our own; and it is certain that the men who founded the American system were of a very different stamp from the Democratic agitators of the present day. The International Association, in announcing that the political power of the working-men must be used for the abolition of all classes, and for their own material and pecuniary advantage, interprets more accurately the objects of Republican aspiration.

#### SPANISH PLEAS FOR REPUDIATION.

THE debates and divisions in the Spanish Congress have been almost unintelligible to foreigners, for the question of good faith to creditors is confused with personal and party issues which have only a local and temporary interest. It is discouraging to learn that the Budget, including the tax on the external debt, has been approved by the Committee to which it was referred; and the King, who makes himself the interpreter of the opinions of the Parliamentary majority, at one time expressed his unabated confidence in the Ministry. It was reported that the Cabinet had determined to regard the tax on the debt as an open question, and that, if the proposal were rejected, the Finance Minister alone would think it necessary to resign. The course which was finally adopted seems to have puzzled those who were most familiar with Spanish political practice. When the Ministry was defeated, the Cortes were suddenly prorogued, as if in preparation for a dissolution, but a few hours later the Ministers resigned in a body. While it was still assumed that the fate of the Government would depend on the reception of the Budget, the Ministerial journals defended the proposed breach of contract by reasons which are familiar to students of Spanish controversy. The advocates of the Government admitted that the deduction of a percentage from the interest was to be regretted, but at the same time they contended that it was necessary and just. If the domestic creditors are to be taxed, they consider that it would be unreasonable and unpatriotic to give a preference to foreigners. It is certain that a Spaniard who so far trusts his own Government as to lend it money ought not to be exceptionally regarded as a subject of taxation; but domestic imposts, however capricious and unequal, are within the power of every independent Legislature. It seems not to occur to the apologists that the capitalists of London are not liable to maintain the army or the civil service of Spain. If they had refused to lend their money, they would have been entirely beyond the reach of the financiers who now propose to extort from them a forced contribution. The excuse of poverty, even if it could in any case be sufficient, is only rendered plausible by want of skill and courage on the part of successive Finance Ministers. The resources of Spain are great, and either by increased taxation or by more rigid economy it would not be difficult to obtain a revenue sufficient to meet the expenditure. When the successive debts were contracted, and especially when the last loan was placed in the market, the agents of the Spanish Government were not instructed to inform capitalists that the country was on the verge of bankruptcy. As a guarantee against a risk which ought to have required no special provision, it was expressly stated that the loan would be exempt from taxation.

The comments on Señor ANGULO's scheme which have been published in England proceed both from indignant creditors and from disinterested commentators on public affairs; and there is little difference in tone between the remonstrances of the victims of spoliation and impartial criticisms which have no object except the assertion of sound principles. Some Spanish papers, and especially the *Epoca*, desire to found a quarrel on the strong language, or rather on the conclusive arguments, which have been used; and it is hinted that those who impugn Spanish honour have no claim to honourable treatment. The *Epoca* has the merit of suggesting a mode of retaliation which could scarcely have been anticipated. The capitalists who some time since advanced 6,000,000*l.* to the Spanish Government were not conscious of any moral or political disability which attached to their character as Englishmen. Even from that faithless nation the Spaniards were content to receive a sum of money on certain agreed conditions; but it now seems that there was a latent claim to be set off against the demand for either interest or principal. In the year 1804, according to the *Epoca*, and therefore only sixty-seven years ago, the English Government seized with illegal violence property belonging to Spain to the amount of 800,000*l.* By the simple process of charging compound interest at 5 per cent. on the alleged sum, it may easily be shown that England is now indebted to Spain in an amount equal to the whole external debt which is to be taxed. It is true that the lenders of the money had nothing to do with the property seized in 1804, and that when they made their contract they received no notice that they were discharging a debt rather than establishing a credit; but probably the creditors will be referred to the English Government for the amount of the claim, while the conscience of Spain will be clear. On the same principle a private debt due to a Frenchman might be repudiated by a Spaniard on account of the plunder of cities and convents by NAPOLEON's Marshals, or by an Englishman in resentment of the lawless detention of civilian visitors to France after the rupture of the Peace of Amiens. Any two States which have been engaged in war with one another during the last century may easily revive charges of violence and injustice as pretexts for similar frauds.

The *Epoca* refers to the capture of the South American treasure-ships in 1804 without a declaration of war. After the renewal of the war between France and England it was notorious that the Prince of the Peace, who then controlled the policy of Spain, was in all respects acting under the dictation of the French Government. PITT was perfectly justified in making war on Spain; but there was more than one objection to the manner in which the rupture was effected. If it was allowable to seize the treasure-ships, a force ought to have been employed for the purpose which would have rendered resistance impossible; yet the English squadron of four frigates which intercepted the ships was exactly equal in force to the Spanish convoy. The Spanish commanding officer could, in consequence, not have surrendered without dishonour, and an unnecessary engagement ensued, with the result of the capture both of the frigates and of the treasure-ships. Lord GRENVILLE in the House of Lords, and Mr. Fox in the House of Commons, protested against the violence which had been committed; and although the conduct of the Government was approved by Parliament, it was generally thought that a mistake had been committed. Four years later NAPOLEON kidnapped the King, and the Heir Apparent of Spain in return for their abject devotion to his interests; and when the Spanish nation rose against the tyranny of the usurper, their resistance was rendered possible and successful by the expenditure of English money to the amount of a hundred times the value of the captured treasure-ships. In the arrangements with the Provisional Government, in the Conventions which were afterwards executed, in the Treaties of Paris and Vienna, there was no reference to the fantastic claim which is now set up as a pretext for cheating capitalists who happen to be English; nor in the course of sixty years has any diplomatic demand been made for reparation of an act which may or may not have exceeded the license of war. An appeal to obsolete national animosities is at all times criminal, but as an excuse for non-payment of a debt it is ludicrously mean.

Although Spanish financiers and journalists are not likely to believe that any exposure of their miscarriages can be disinterested, it is really more advantageous to Spain than to the capitalists who speculate in loans that the national good faith should be maintained. The eccentric proceedings of Roumania, of Michigan, and of Spain, to a certain extent raise the price of all foreign loans, and where there is an element of



uncertainty there are always profits to be realized. As far as Spain is concerned, nothing can be more unwise than to kill the goose which has laid so many golden eggs. The terms of every future loan will be more onerous in consequence of the repudiation, if it is effected, and even of the discussion which has been raised; yet it is doubtful whether the gravity of the Ministerial project has been fully appreciated either by supporters or by opponents. The leaders of parties have of late been engaged in more exciting conflicts, ending in the overthrow of the Government. The friends of ZORRILLA moved a vote of want of confidence in the present Ministry, on the plausible ground that it represented no party in the country. It had indeed been supposed that MALCAMPO was in close alliance with ZORRILLA; but the hostile motion seems to prove that the Ministers had determined rather to connect themselves with SAGASTA. Between the two hostile chiefs, both of whom assume the title of Progressists, there is no apparent difference of political opinion; but a struggle among personal factions is often more bitter than a legitimate conflict of parties. It would seem that the Budget has occupied little space in the debates, though the comparatively irrelevant subject of the cession of Cuba has given rise to much animated controversy. In all probability financial legislation will be adjourned until the more interesting question of the distribution of political power has been determined; nor, indeed, will it be possible to discuss the Budget until February or March. Any Ministry which may be definitively formed will do well, as soon as possible, to reassure the foreign creditors. If ZORRILLA returns to power, it will be natural to regret the confusion which has followed his temporary retirement. Since the death of PRIM, the prospects of regular and constitutional government in Spain have constantly become less cheerful. The suspension of petty jealousies and of minor differences has been abruptly terminated; and now, as in former times, personal ambition seems to be the chief motive of political action. If Parliamentary government proves itself a failure, the vicious circle will be completed by the return to power of military adventurers.

#### ELEMENTARY EDUCATION IN IRELAND.

WHEN Parliament meets the Government will probably be compelled to say something about Irish Education, but it may be assumed that it will postpone a positive declaration of its intentions as long as possible. It is natural that it should be in no hurry to precipitate a discussion in which, no matter what line it takes, it must risk alienating some of its supporters. But, though the policy of postponement answered in 1871, it may be less easily carried out in 1872. For one thing, longer reticence may give more offence than an outspoken declaration of their intentions; for another, the introduction of the controversy does not altogether rest with the Government. Any Irish Roman Catholic member may force it on on one side; Mr. FAWCETT is sure to force it on on the other side. Mysterious generalities are weapons that perish in the using, and when Mr. GLADSTONE next speaks on this subject, whether the debate is of his own raising or of some one else's, he may have no choice but to make his meaning clear. In the opinion of a good many persons the result of his doing so, whether this year or next year, will be extremely disastrous for the Liberal party. The Opposition probably cherish some cheerful anticipations of this kind, and they are to a certain extent borne out by the vindictive satisfaction with which the Radical section of the Ministerial following look forward to gratifying their principles and their passions by one and the same act of desertion. It is far from impossible, however, that these expectations may be disappointed as signally as the similar forebodings which came to nothing in 1870. The Elementary Education Bill threatened to provoke a formidable Liberal schism; but in the end the schismatics were few, and even these few did not carry their independence to any extravagant lengths. Probably they have now determined to make a bolder stand; indeed, they can scarcely avoid doing so unless they wish to strip the threats that come from below the gangway of all their terrors. But it may be doubted whether their appearance in the lobby will be proportionate to their appearance in debate. The malcontents of the Education League assume that they represent the whole body of English Dissenters, and it may be conceded that they represent so many of them as think it needful to give present expression to their opinions on educational matters. But it may yet turn out that there are

Dissenters who, though they may not feel called upon to beard Mr. MIALL or Mr. DIXON on a public platform, will not instruct their representatives to follow these two gentlemen into opposition upon pain of losing their seats. For though an alliance with the Nonconformist Left may have many charms for ingenious Conservatives, it is a kind of coalition which it is not easy to work. And the nearer seems the chance of having to take office, the less inclined will the Opposition leaders be to increase their difficulties in Ireland by a quarrel *à outrance* with the Roman Catholic clergy. It is on the cards, therefore, that the clouds may break, as clouds have broken before, and that the storm which is to drive Mr. GLADSTONE from power may after all resolve itself into a display of summer lightning.

This speculation rests of course on the hypothesis that the Government proposals will not be of the nature of a theological challenge. It would be easy enough to deal with the question both of primary and of University education in Ireland in such a manner as to make the life of the Ministry not worth a week's purchase. All that would be wanted for this purpose would be a scheme for subsidizing Roman Catholic teaching in primary schools and for endowing a Roman Catholic University. There is nothing, however, in the recent speech of Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE at Bristol, nor in any of the earlier indications let fall from time to time by the PRIME MINISTER, which points to any such design. As regards primary education, which is all we shall at present concern ourselves with, Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE expressly asserts that the existing national system "can and ought to be maintained in all its essential character," and it is still to be seen whether it is not quite possible to remove any reasonable objections which the Roman Catholic clergy may entertain towards that system without in the least impairing this essential character. The original object of the national system was to give combined literary and separate religious instruction. Children of different denominations were to attend the same school, to learn the same secular lessons, and to be separated only during the hours devoted to the teaching of their several creeds. Had the religions into which the population of Ireland is divided been distributed in the same proportions over all parts of the country, so that every school would have contained Roman Catholics and Protestants, no objection would have been raised by the former against any precautions against proselytism which the Commissioners might have thought it advisable to take. The Roman Catholic bishops have all along insisted strenuously on the necessity of a stringent conscience clause in mixed schools, and in their recent pastoral they repeat this demand in the strongest possible terms. But as a matter of fact a large number of Irish schools are not mixed. In 1867, out of the 6,386 schools of the National Board, 2,320, with 355,617 children on the rolls, were attended exclusively by Roman Catholics. It is only as regards these schools that the bishops find fault with the prohibitions of the Board as useless and vexatious, and demand "the removal of all restrictions upon religious instruction." All the scholars, they say, belong to the same Church, receive secular and religious instruction from the same teacher, and practise out of school hours the same religious observances. Why then should the religious lessons be confined to certain fixed hours, instead of being left to the discretion of the teacher; and why should the crucifix which hangs on the wall out of school hours be removed while the work of secular instruction is going on? We admit, they go on, that these restrictions are unavoidable when there are Protestant children attending the school; but rules which are unobjectionable when there is an obvious necessity for them may become objectionable if they are enforced in the absence of such necessity. Roman Catholic children can understand the suspension during school hours of the religious observances habitual to them, when it is put on the ground of there being Protestant children present. It is their suspension during school hours when there are no Protestant children present that is, we are told, calculated to give them wrong notions of the place of religion in education.

If it were possible to ensure that these schools should always be attended by Roman Catholics only, this reasoning might fairly be admitted. So long as the State secures the prescribed minimum of secular instruction, it can have no motive for harassing those who give it by regulations which in their case have no meaning. But if exclusively Roman Catholic schools are exempted from the rules of the National Board, what certainty is there that they will remain exclusively Roman Catholic? At present, it may be, there are no Protestant children in the district; but Protestant children may be born in it, or Protestant families may migrate into it,

and how is the State to guarantee them the immediate revival of those safeguards "against even the suspicion of proselytism" which the Irish bishops acknowledge to be essential in mixed schools? The Royal Commissioners on Primary Education in Ireland hold that the continued maintenance of these safeguards, even where there is no present need for them, is indispensable to the end in view. "We are of opinion," they say, "that in all places where there is only one school which can reasonably expect support from the State . . . the secular instruction should be separated from the religious, so that every child in the place can have the benefit of secular instruction without any danger of his receiving religious instruction to which his parent may conscientiously object." It may be asked why it is not enough to enforce this separation whenever information is given to some officer of the National Board that a Protestant child has joined the school? The answer is one of which the Roman Catholic bishops will not, we think, refuse to admit the force. Such a provision as this would throw on the parent the responsibility of taking a step which would give considerable annoyance to the managers of the school. For the sake of a single child, perhaps, they would be required to remodel all their school arrangements, to alter the hours of the religious lessons, to banish religious emblems, to forbid religious observances. Is it likely that an Irish peasant will make himself thus obnoxious to his superiors? It may be said that, the upper classes being usually Protestants, he will find a supporter in the squire against any ill-will which may be borne him by the priest. But the non-mixed schools in Ireland are not all Roman Catholic. There are some which are at present attended only by Protestants; and what would be the position of a Roman Catholic peasant coming into a district and having to choose between making enemies of the squire and the parson and allowing his child to attend a Protestant school? A regulation of this kind would raise in a new form the question which has been the cause of so much bitter controversy in Ireland—the question whether the responsibility of withdrawing Roman Catholic children from Protestant religious instruction, or Protestant children from Roman Catholic religious instruction, shall fall upon the parent or the school managers. The Royal Commissioners rightly recommend that it shall fall in all cases on the managers, and the arguments which establish this conclusion are equally applicable to the case of schools in places where there is only one for the whole population. It is in the interest of the Roman Catholics themselves at least as much as in that of the Protestants that the existing restrictions should be maintained. Inasmuch, however, as the necessity for this strictness rests on the assumption that there is but one school in the neighbourhood to which children can be sent, the Royal Commissioners recommend that in places where there are two schools, one Protestant and one Roman Catholic, with an average attendance of twenty-five children each, the National Board shall be empowered to subsidize such schools without requiring any conditions as to religion beyond the exclusion of children belonging to a different creed during the hours of religious instruction.

A further difficulty presents itself in the case of training schools for teachers. In England these are provided by the voluntary efforts of the several denominations, the Education Department only undertaking to inspect the schools, to examine the candidates sent up by them, and to make grants for every candidate who succeeds in obtaining a certificate. In Ireland, on the contrary, the National Board maintains a central training school from which religious instruction is necessarily excluded, except as it may be given by the ministers of different denominations, who are permitted to attend for that purpose at appointed times. The result of this system is best seen in the fact mentioned in the episcopal pastoral—that, of about 9,000 teachers, 5,700 are untrained. The Roman Catholics of Ireland will not put up with teachers who, as they hold, have received no religious education worth speaking of. Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE regards it as "absolutely necessary, in order to obtain a good popular system of education, that greater facilities shall be given for the training of schoolmasters upon the system which prevails in England;" and in the same spirit the Royal Commission recommends that the aid of the Board shall be given, under proper conditions, to training schools managed by committees, voluntary societies, or religious bodies. As regards primary education, therefore, the only point in which the demands of the Irish bishops go beyond the recommendations of the Royal Commission is the degree of freedom to be accorded to "schools which are ex-

clusively Catholic." For the reasons given above we question whether this request will be persisted in. None of the others are of a kind to which any consistent Liberal ought to object, or which are not implicitly sanctioned by the English Education Act. If the question of the higher education should prove equally manageable, the Government need have no great dread of taking it in hand.

## FRANCE.

M. GAMBETTA stands to the French Conservatives in the position of the plaintiff's attorney. "Whenever other subjects fail them they take to abusing him. As events turned out, it might have been better if France had made peace in the autumn instead of in the spring, but it is hardly decent to impute it as a crime to M. GAMBETTA that he refused to despair of success until the last card had been played. It may be true that the ex-Dictator has not shown any special qualifications for the leadership of a Parliamentary party; but, in the present condition of France, it is a great point gained that this should be the post he claims. Hitherto French Republicanism has been more at home on a barricade than in the tribune, and if M. GAMBETTA had not so far broken with the traditions of his party as to prefer logical to physical weapons, there might have been nothing for his countrymen to look forward to except an infinite series of revolutions and reactions. His speech the other day at St. Quentin is remarkable for its accurate appreciation of the two kinds of Conservatism which are to be found in France. Nothing can be truer than his description of the men who are indifferent to everything except their balance-sheet, and whose only conception of society is that of a Limited Liability Company, in which the manager undertakes to supply soldiers, priests, and gendarmes. Considering the narrowness of view which usually characterizes Continental Republicans, it is creditable to M. GAMBETTA that his insight into this phase of opinion has not prevented him from seeing that there is a better type of Conservatism which has its fitting place in any Democratic system. A party devoted to progress requires as its appropriate complement a party whose instinct is to question the expediency of change. Without some such check good institutions and bad would alike fall victims to that restless desire for novelty which is only useful when it is carefully kept within bounds. Language of this sort is not so common in the mouth of a French Radical as to make it a matter of little moment that the man who uses it is the only candidate for the Republican leadership.

The attitude which the National Assembly has from time to time taken gives some degree of justice to M. GAMBETTA's criticisms. It is difficult to believe that the majority can contemplate determining the form of government without a new appeal to the electors, but their desire to declare the Assembly constituent has had its natural result in the creation of a very general impression to that effect. It may be that their aim was only to anticipate objections to the competence of the Chamber to deal with the many important measures which must come before it in the approaching Session. But it would have been easy to make it known that this was their purpose by an unmistakable disclaimer of any ulterior design. We do not blame them, as M. GAMBETTA does, for treating the existing form of government as provisional; but there are two senses in which the term provisional may be taken, and unfortunately they have not shown much desire to make it clear which it is that they adopt. The Government of M. THIERS may be provisional in so far as it is charged with the special duty of paying off the indemnity, and of carrying on affairs until the conclusion of their task shall leave France free to pronounce between a Monarchy and a Republic. Or it may be provisional as being merely a makeshift, only intended to last until the present Assembly thinks it safe to give effect to its real wishes by directing it to make way for a Monarchy. If the latter view is the one favoured by the majority, M. GAMBETTA has good reason for denouncing them as usurpers. Representation is reduced to a mere farce if deputies chosen to pronounce on the question of peace or war assume the right a year afterwards of pronouncing on a totally different question of far more lasting importance. If, on the other hand, they regard the Assembly itself as equally provisional with the Executive, M. GAMBETTA's accusation falls to the ground. The course which he himself seems to wish the Assembly to take would be open to the same objection as that which he deprecates. If we understand him rightly, his demand for a dissolution is based on the hypothesis that the existing Chamber, if it decides the constitutional question



at all, will decide it in favour of Monarchy, notwithstanding that the country has unequivocally pronounced in favour of a Republic. If the majority could be trusted to vote in this latter sense, M. GAMBETTA would no longer refuse to recognise the Assembly as constituent. It does not appear that this theory of a popular decision pronounced since February is supported by any adequate evidence. M. GAMBETTA refers for confirmation of it to the votes given first in the complementary elections to the Assembly, and next in the elections for the Departmental Councils. As regards the former, the opinion of the best and least biased judges seemed at the time to be that the majority returned was Republican rather from the notion that so long as the Republic meant M. THIERS it meant the best obtainable guarantee for order and property, than from any matured conviction that it was either the best form of government in the abstract or the best suited to France at the present time. As regards the latter, again, so many other considerations came into play that it is hard to say whether the return of a Republican candidate meant that the electors disliked the idea of a Restoration or the fact of local taxation. Under these circumstances the Assembly would be as much exceeding its legitimate powers if it adopted a permanent Constitution of the Republican type as if it declared the Count of CHAMBORD or the Count of PARIS King. Nor is there any real need that it should do either one or the other. Most of the subjects that are usually included in paper Constitutions are such as may be discussed with no difference of result, whether the officer who finally approves the measures of the Legislature be called President or King. It is only the actual constitution of the Executive that is shut out. The organization of the army, the powers and appointment of the judiciary, the promotion of primary education, the development of local administration, and still more of local legislation, are matters grave enough to command the attention of any Legislature in the world. Upon every one of these points the new Constitution whenever it comes will probably have something to say, and the chapters that will ultimately be devoted to them may very well be debated under the name, not of a Constitution, but of so many distinct and independent measures. In the meantime, it would be well if the Assembly or M. THIERS would come to some better understanding about the Communist prisoners. It is not easy to give an intelligible reason for continuing to invest the trials with a military character now that the ordinary Courts are in a position to resume their functions. At all events, if Courts-martial are to go on trying civilians for civil offences, they might at least display the military virtue of speed. If it proves to be true that the sentence upon Captain ROSSEL was executed yesterday, very deep disgrace will rest on the authors of the decision. There are some amongst the prisoners now waiting for death on whom mercy would be thrown away; but to include Captain ROSSEL among them is to confound mistaken patriotism with premeditated treason.

There is some show of foundation for the complaint of the Bonapartists that newspapers are suppressed under the Republic which would have been allowed to live under the Empire. The charge against the Administration which has been fatal to the *Pays* and the *Avenir Libéral* has been brought at one time or another against every Government that France has seen. Whenever a riot has been suppressed, the defeated party have hinted that the authorities got it up for their own purposes. It was a common accusation during the later years of NAPOLEON III., and it is quite possible that the suppressed journals had no idea that in repeating it they were going beyond the permitted license of their craft. But the Imperialist organs show few traces of that skill in the art of allusion which distinguished the Liberal press when it was in permanent opposition. The assertion that the Government had planned the little outbreak at Ajaccio was made with a baldness which did little credit to the ingenuity of the writers. It might have been more dignified in the Government to have passed it over, but the existence of an official journal made it more difficult to do this in France than in countries where the authorities are not burdened with this inconvenient appendage. If no notice had been taken of the charge, it would probably have been accepted as true; if the Government had plunged into a newspaper war, it would have given the journals in question a series of opportunities for repeating and amplifying the accusation; and it was probably the want of any way out of this dilemma that drove M. THIERS to take refuge in immediate suppression.

#### THE CONFERENCE ON THE LICENCE LAWS.

WE agree with Mr. BASS that the assailants of his friends the publicans are not largely endowed with common sense. A Conference has been held this week on the Licence Laws, in which the principal speakers assumed rather the character of fanatics than of men of business. They discuss proposals for limiting the hours of opening public-houses in London, without considering how such proposals, if enacted, could be put in force. One speaker wishes to close these houses at eleven P.M., while another speaker contends for ten, and another for nine P.M., as the hour for closing. The numerous class of persons who frequent theatres and concerts and wish for a little beer on their way home are regarded as unimportant, or perhaps deserving of suppression, by these enthusiasts. It appears, however, that if the Conference did no other good, it at least showed the difficulty of determining how far what is called amendment of the law ought to proceed. We have been accustomed to hear that the working-men demand, or that their wives and children demand for them, that temptations to drunkenness should be removed by the closing of public-houses. But it is now suggested that the sale of intoxicating drinks by confectioners has led many women, and in some cases young boys, into habits of intemperance, and therefore that confectioners and publicans ought to be brought alike under a restrictive law. We believe that the grant to confectioners of licences, which it is now proposed to take away, was regarded when it was made as an improvement in our social system. It was said that the licensed victualler's sale of food was to his sale of drink in the proportion of FALSTAFF's bread to his sack, and that there ought to be houses where eating was the staple and drinking only an accessory of the business. We should have thought that both the bodily and mental health of the population of London would be promoted by the establishment of this class of houses in competition with the publicans. However, the limitation of confectioners' as well as other licences was demanded by the majority of the Conference; while, on the other hand, some speakers maintained that "ladies" would not be able to get necessary refreshment if the confectioners' licences were withdrawn, because they could not with comfort enter public-houses or coffee-shops. The Association, which, as Mr. BASS says, consists of an archbishop, two bishops, and several other persons, was not drawn into the folly of attempting to distinguish between a lady and a woman. Indeed we suspect that under the guise of "necessary refreshment" there is an amount of pernicious tipping among ladies of the middle and upper classes which, if restriction were possible, might as well deserve it as do the drinking propensities of women, or even men, of the lower class. The Conference has accomplished a *reductio ad absurdum* of its own argument. It would be useless to limit the publicans, and leave the confectioners unfettered. And it would be impossible to adopt general restriction unless upon the theory, which the Conference does not adopt, that the manufacture, importation, and sale of intoxicating liquors ought to be alike prohibited. We are told that at this Conference "the licence to grocers was also strongly disapproved," which means that the speakers are becoming sensible that they cannot prevent drinking by merely closing public-houses. We are so far in agreement with the Conference that we think that these grocers' licences might supply means for private indulgence, which is worse in its physical and mental influences than drinking in a public room. There was reason in the theory on which beer-houses were originally established, although in practice they have been mischievous. It was said that a supply of wholesome beer would wean people from gin. We adopt this theory so far that we should not wish to see the publican's trade transferred to the grocer; but at the same time the grocer does a trade of his own which we take leave to call useful, in supplying families of small consumption with a bottle or two of wine. He does not sell spirits properly so called, but we all know that much of what passes for sherry contains a considerable quantity of spirit of a fiery and pernicious kind. Any person who keeps a grocer's shop, or indeed a shop of any kind, may obtain a licence to sell foreign wine, and the Act of Parliament which confers this privilege was represented when it was passed as generally beneficial. If there are now two grocers holding licences in a street, and one of these licences should be taken away, the holder of the remaining licence would do almost twice as much business in wine as before. It would therefore be impossible to restrict the number of these licences, and the Conference, if it values consistency, must propose to abolish them altogether. But even the archbishop and two bishops, with the help of several other persons, are hardly prepared to go that length. It is

unfortunate that some of the leaders of this Association are unable to contemplate human life otherwise than on the ascetic side. Archbishop MANNING, when it was urged on him that an artisan returning, on a Sunday evening in summer, from an excursion to Richmond or Hampton Court to his dwelling in St. Giles's, required beer before going to bed, answered that he did not see the necessity. Of course, if people ought not to go to theatres, they cannot properly demand refreshment after the performance.

But let us describe a case from actual observation, and consider how the principles of the Association would apply to it. About two miles from a large town is an old-fashioned public-house, standing back from the road, with a fine, spreading elm-tree in front of it, and benches under the shade of the tree. This public-house is a favourite resort of the working-men of the town and their wives and families, on Sunday evenings in summer. The walk is pleasant, and the rest and—if we may say so—the beer, are more pleasant still. Archbishop MANNING would doubtless say that the working-man, accompanied by his wife, and driving before him one or two babies in a perambulator, might walk as far as he pleased into the country, and then might walk back to his home in the town. But we ask any reader who desires in his own person to enjoy life, whether he would find this an attractive programme? Of course, if public-houses should be closed on Sundays, these excursions would be entirely destroyed; and if the hours of opening should be further limited, they would be seriously interfered with. Let us add that this public-house is really in the country, having green lanes in its vicinity, where spring flowers grow abundantly. If this public-house were closed, the working-men who now frequent it would almost certainly remain in the town, where they would smoke their pipes and drink beer, or perhaps gin, procured for their Sunday use the night before. No Conference on this subject it likely to arrive at a valuable conclusion unless it takes account of human nature as it is, and not merely as archbishops and bishops desire it to be. The comparison has been made before, and it may usefully be made again, between this country and Germany, where the mass of the population drink vast quantities of beer, and few of them get drunk. The social instinct which carries the German to his beer-garden exists also in England, and it cannot be disregarded by prudent legislators.

This Association claims a character for moderation which is hardly affected by the Alliance. Its leaders appear to expect to obtain general support for their proposal to transfer the control of licences from magistrates to Boards elected by ratepayers of districts. They have, however, adopted this proposal from some persons more clever than themselves, without perceiving what it really means. Extreme Liberals desire to supersede magistrates by Boards as one among many steps towards diminishing what may be roughly called the aristocratic influence in this country. But Conservatives or moderate Liberals may think that what remains of this influence may be usefully preserved. It will at any rate be soon enough to change the administrators of the law when the law with necessary amendments is shown to be unsatisfactorily administered. Magistrates are as sensible as their neighbours of the duty of regulating public-houses, and when they have the power they will show the will to remedy all well-founded complaints. We believe that the number of existing licences will sufficiently reduce itself within a few years, and that there is no need of any arrangement for buying up licences, or of an Association consisting of archbishops and bishops to provide it. Mr. KINGSLEY described at a recent meeting "an average country parish," which he has known for the last thirty years, and which contains a "tippling shop" for every seventy inhabitants. Mr. KINGSLEY's knowledge, doubtless, comprises the magistrates of the district; and if he will inquire of them how so many tippling shops came into existence in it, and will state the substance of their answers at the next meeting he attends, he will usefully contribute towards sound legislation on this subject. Those who are responsible for order can scarcely desire that the elements of disorder should be multiplied in their neighbourhood. Mr. KINGSLEY is either a magistrate himself, or he has influence with magistrates, and we think that he and other speakers at these meetings are not adopting the most effectual means to promote temperance when they countenance an agitation which is, to some extent, political. The diminution of tippling shops under the Act of 1869 is a sufficient proof that magistrates do not require any Association or Alliance to urge them to perform their duty.

#### THE LOVE OF FAME.

IT is curious to reflect upon some of those well-worn platitudes upon which we used to write themes in our schoolboy days. They have a faded and melancholy appearance now. We smile rather sadly when a young George Osborne informs us, with all gravity, that selfishness is the most odious and contemptible of all the vices which degrade the human character. Absurd as that piece of information seems, we remember that there was a period in our own lives when we were innocent enough to be considerably impressed by the remark, and even that there was a period in the world's history when it passed for a profound and original observation. We can never look upon a copybook maxim without reflections—not much more original perhaps than those in the copybook itself—on the sad vicissitudes of fortune. The maxim resembles some venerable old lady in whom we dimly discern the traces of youthful beauty. It is a kind of *memento mori*; a proof that not only human beings, but even what are called eternal truths, may lose their freshness in the lapse of centuries. Just consider, for example, all the platitudes that have been uttered about the love of fame. There was a time when the advantages and disadvantages of that passion were gravely discussed by philosophers and men of the world. When they had squeezed all the freshness out of the subject, it was turned over to the moralists; and now it has sunk in its downward course to the hands of schoolmasters; if, indeed, the infant mind is not in these days too sophisticated to be treated to such humble fare. It would apparently be as useless to extract any valuable matter from such an antiquated topic as to make soup from bones that have been exposed for years upon a dust-heap. All the wise saws on both sides of the question should be shovelled away amongst the mountains of sterile rubbish that have been accumulated by the instructors of mankind in the course of ages.

There is, however, one way in which the question may be approached. Aphorisms of the kind we are considering are perhaps rather transformed than extinguished. They retire out of sight because they are no longer applicable to the state of society, but they make room for some truism of a similar character. It is not difficult to see for what reasons we have become less interested than formerly in talking about "the last infirmity of noble minds." It no longer produces any very sensible effects upon society. We go on for the most part in such a well-regulated and orderly manner that there is little chance for irregular outbursts of ambition. The relative importance of the individual has declined, according to the theory so ingeniously expounded by De Tocqueville; and nobody aspires to be anything more than one of the more important wheels in a vast piece of machinery, where no single wheel can really be of vital importance. The love of fame is therefore supplanted by a love of success; and by success we mean having a steady balance at our bankers, and receiving invitations to dinner from the most respectable people in our circle of life. Perhaps we may be conscious of instincts that under other circumstances would encourage us to wade through slaughter to a throne; but the chance of either performing that feat or scattering plenty over a smiling land is so extremely remote that it does not practically enter into our calculations. Even in the rare cases where a modern emperor or statesman may be said without too daring hyperbole to have done something of the kind, the tendency of modern thought is to regard him as rather the puppet than the puller of the string. He is the outward and visible symbol of the great forces at work, and does not originate them himself. When men have ceased to be demigods, it is easier to be reconciled to the ordinary lot of humanity. In fact, everybody's experience shows him how much of the best work that is done in the world is practically anonymous. The great political leader may be only the stalking-horse under cover of whom small resolute subordinates do the really important work. In every profession there are many men whose abilities are fully recognised by the small number of qualified observers, but whose very names are totally unknown to the general public, and will probably be forgotten in the next generation by all except a few curious inquirers. When the arbitrary distribution of reputation is recognised, a reasonable man cannot think it of much importance whether or not he draws one of the tickets in the lottery which entitles him to praise as well as to solid pudding.

For some such reasons, the love of fame, so far as it exists, is restricted to a narrower area and is of a less virulent character than of old. It generally breaks out in young men about the time of their University career, when they imagine the eyes of the universe to be fixed upon the writers of prize-poems, and the most popular orators at the Unions. After that period it subsides with singular rapidity, unless the patient happens to have selected one of those walks of life in which fame has a high commercial value. A poet or a novelist or a politician is nothing if he is not famous; and the only difficulty is to decide whether he loves his reputation as a means to substantial rewards or cherishes it for its own sake. We may assume, therefore, that there is a small minority of mankind to whom the old formulas are still more or less applicable, and who would perhaps be accessible to the old-fashioned maxims. Let us imagine a young gentleman setting out with the impression that he is to be the great poet of his age; and though the number of such persons cannot be reckoned by thousands, we should certainly not exaggerate if we assumed that it runs into hundreds. Probably they are for the most part very foolish people; but three or four of them may possess real genius, and in a larger number of cases they may be estimable youths of decidedly more



than the average ability. What fragment of the old morality may still be more or less appropriate to their case?

No reasonable person would desire entirely to quench their ardour. A good poet is a very excellent thing; and it is a highly general law of nature that for every genuine success there should be a large number of failures. As millions of young herrings are consumed for every herring that comes to perfection, so for every poet who wins an enduring reputation there must be dozens who never get beyond a temporary blaze of glory in the poet's corner of a magazine. It would therefore be by no means desirable, even if it were possible, to check the rise of ambition in innumerable cases where it is destined never to meet with a sufficient gratification. We would only wish, therefore, that these raw aspirants did not magnify their office to such a degree as to encourage an exorbitant vanity. There are instances enough, if we cared to quote them, where a very promising young man has been hopelessly spoilt because he conceived himself to have a claim to be reckoned as a centre of the universe. The besetting sin of most ambitious youths is an inordinate conception of the praise which they would deserve even if their boldest conceptions of their own abilities could be fully justified. For such persons, who, it need hardly be added, are an indefinitely small minority of mankind, some few of the old truisms may still have their advantage. Let us assume, for example, that some youth of two or three and twenty now fancies—and it would be absurd to make such an assumption for anybody of riper years—that he has a fair chance of being equal to Shakespeare. Very well; but suppose you are destined to reach a place of such eminence that not more than half-a-dozen men have attained to it since the art of writing was invented, what is the good of being a Shakespeare? We do not speak of the personal advantage to the fortunate exception, but of the benefit conferred upon mankind at large. Undoubtedly, the benefit to the human race is sufficiently large to make it a worthy object of the devotion of the whole abilities which any human being possesses. But it may be worth while also to keep an eye upon the limits even of an influence so much exceeding all ordinary experience. Shakespeare, according to a caricature of Leech, was a very much overrated man. We would not express so heretical a sentiment; but we confess that it seems to us probable that the influence even of so marvellous a mind upon the general development of the human intellect has been considerably overrated. Two or three obvious considerations look in this direction. Shakespeare is a name which is never quoted without every possible demonstration of respect. Little more than two centuries and a-half have elapsed since his death, and yet it is a curious question how many Englishmen at the present day have even heard of Shakespeare. Leaving out all those persons who can neither read nor write, and all those who can read and write nothing more than their name in a marriage register, we have already reduced the number of those who could be said to be really acquainted with his reputation to a minority of the nation. Subtract again the immense number of those who, having heard of him, have never read his plays, and from the residue subtract once more the number of those who have glanced at his pages with less attention than they would give to Dickens or Mr. Wilkie Collins. We have already come down to the small minority of those who are conventionally known as well-educated persons. Amongst them, the great majority have read just enough of his best known works to be able to pass muster in ordinary conversation. Those who have really studied even such plays as *Hamlet* or *Othello* sufficiently to be able to give off-hand a tolerably accurate account of their characteristics, are again a small minority, and of them a great many study Shakespeare as, in every sense of the word, a dead writer. To find those whose mental development has been seriously affected by their studies, we must again make another sweeping deduction. Probably the ultimate result would be so small as to astonish people who are apt to take popular sayings on such questions at their apparent value. We suspect that even that limited number of writers who may be described by the ordinary title of great world-poets materially affect the education of a wonderfully small number of persons at a distance of a few generations. It is true that those whom they affect are amongst the *élite* of the race, and that through them the influence is filtered to a much larger audience. But if such considerations as we have suggested be allowed their due weight, we suspect that the force exerted even by the very greatest of intellects known to history is far less than is sometimes carelessly assumed.

What is the inference to be deduced from such facts, if they are admitted to be accurate? Merely that the prevailing platitudes which we have inherited from past generations still tend to exaggerate the influence actually exerted by individuals. And the practical moral would be that there is a good deal of force in the modern view which tends to lessen the value even of the most indisputable glory. It is true that it is easy to pass into the opposite exaggeration. The theory that the efforts of no single person can be of any lasting importance is perhaps more dangerous, and more easily applied as an opiate to uneasy consciences. We only say that if a man finds himself tormented by an unruly vanity, he will do well to reflect on the obvious deductions which are to be made even from the most splendid reputations. He should remember them, not in order to diminish his energy, but to remind himself that efforts which never bear any conspicuous fruit may approach in actual value to the noisier kinds of fame more nearly than is generally supposed. But we feel that we are verging upon the

moral platitudes of which we have spoken. After all, there are a good many questions upon which it is impossible to say anything new; and in such cases we may accept the proverb that silence is golden, whilst it would be an over-estimate to say that speech is silver. It is made of more very commonplace metal, which passes current only too freely in speeches and annual exhibitions.

#### THE RELIGIOUS CONTEST IN GERMANY.

BOTH the Old Catholics in Germany and the bishops who represented their views in the Council, but who have now become their most active persecutors, have been busy during the last few weeks. That the clergy, as a rule, show so few signs of open opposition is not surprising, when their position of utter dependence on their ecclesiastical superiors is remembered. For instance, a priest of the diocese of Paderborn, one of the few that have had the courage of their convictions, and who has therefore thrice undergone imprisonment in a monastery, thus describes the condition of things in his own diocese. It contains 587 parishes or ecclesiastical districts, of which 51 are in the gift of the Government, and 71 under lay patronage, the remaining 465 being in the appointment of the Bishop; and of these 465 benefices considerably more than half are filled, not by parish priests who have fixed canonical rights, but by persons removable at the arbitrary will of the bishops, as we may observe in passing is the case with all parish priests in France since the Concordat with Napoleon I. In nine cases out of ten their bread, as well as their position and character, is at the mercy of the bishop. We can hardly wonder then at being told by the same authority, Herr Mönnikes, that never since the time of Boniface VIII. have such strenuous efforts been made to substitute for the ancient constitution of the Church a new programme, of which the two articles are, to quote the well-known saying of Cardinal Bonnechose in the French Chamber, "The bishop gives the word of command, and the clergy march." In Bavaria the Government have themselves very much to thank for the seeming apathy and hostility of the great body of the priests. The recent official declaration of Herr von Luitz is indeed as weighty and satisfactory as could be desired; but, as his critics on the spot have very naturally observed, it comes a good six months too late. Had it been made at Easter instead of in October, a large number—much larger, according to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, than is generally supposed—of the clergy who submitted with a bad conscience to the threats of their Archbishop would have taken their stand with Dr. Dollinger and his allies. It is only a sort of *mauvaise honte* that now holds them back from disavowing their forced adhesion, and it seems not unlikely that the pressure of popular discontent with the new dogma may drive them into a more honest attitude. The violence of the infallibilist bishops and clergy is bitterly resented both in town and country; and though, to quote the words of the *Allgemeine*, "the movement against episcopal absolutism advances silently and shyly, so too did Christianity in its first beginnings." Meanwhile two notable instances have already occurred of direct defiance of the infallibilist threats of the hierarchy, which deserve to be put on record.

It appears that the parish priests of Kiefersfelden and Tuntenthausen had refused to accept the new dogma, and the Archbishop of Munich, encouraged perhaps by the warm eulogium recently pronounced by the Pope on his new-born zeal against the faith he once preached, determined to make an example of them. On the 24th of October decrees were issued, pronouncing against both of them the greater excommunication for their rebellion against the Church and open unbelief, whereby they had incurred the "crime of formal and external heresy." They were also threatened with deprivation of their benefices if they made any opposition to the spiritual vicars sent by the Archbishop to take charge of their parishes. Not content with this formal sentence, his Grace wished to make an example of the malcontents by denouncing them in person; but he was hardly prepared for the reception he met with. On October 28 he solemnly excommunicated the parish priest of Tuntenthausen, Hosemann, from the pulpit of his own church. But no sooner had he left the pulpit than the excommunicated priest himself entered it in his robes and read the following protest:—

The Archbishop has to-day excommunicated me because I have not submitted to the decrees of the sham Council of the Vatican, which its most distinguished members have described as "a conspiracy against divine faith and right," and its new dogmas as "neither taught by the Apostles nor believed by the Fathers," but soul-destroying errors, contradicting the teachings of the Church and based on fraud. Bishops and Archbishops—the Archbishop of Munich among them, if I mistake not—left this "Synod of Sycophants" [a phrase borrowed from Quirinus, if we remember right] with a protest, declaring they could never change their belief. Remembering the words of these Bishops, who, at the close of the Council, reminded their colleagues that "we must hold fast to the end, and show the world an example of courage and perseverance," I will hold fast to the end, and thus remain true to the Catholic Church, from which, I make bold to say, the Archbishop of Munich, with other Bishops, has fallen away. I will remain a member of the Catholic Church as it existed up to July 18, 1870, not of the new Papal Church manufactured by the ambition of the Jesuits and dangerous to the State. And I appeal against the excommunication, which I hold to be unlawful and invalid, from fallible men to the infallible God, who will be merciful to me here and hereafter.

At Kiefersfelden the priest was equally obdurate, and the people seem to have been more so. While the Archbishop was pronouncing sentence within the Church, the Pfarrer Bernard was

addressing his congregation from a stone pulpit outside the walls, and his Grace, in attempting to interrupt him, was met with cries of "You lie here as you lied at Rome," and "Away with the renegade, the apostate priest!" On the 10th of November a second decree was issued from the Archbishop's Chancery, depriving the contumacious clergy of their benefices and all rights thereby accruing, "on account of their pertinacious contempt of legitimate authority, and hardened unbelief and separation from the Church." This sentence, we presume, will be a dead letter after the recent manifesto of the Government. It only remains to add that on the Sunday after the excommunication Michels and Friedrich addressed a meeting of fifteen hundred *Altkatholiken* at Kiefersfelden. Of course they also were excommunicated.

If we turn from Bavaria to Prussia, there too the hostile forces are set in array against each other. A manifesto by several Prussian bishops in favour of the Jesuits rather reminds one of the old proverb, *Qui s'excuse s'accuse*. But their address to the Emperor, signed by the Archbishops of Cologne and Gnesen and eleven other prelates, and his reply, are more important documents. It is worth remarking that the first two of the signatories, the Archbishop of Cologne and the Prince Bishop of Breslau, were conspicuous in the Opposition at Rome, though certainly no one would suppose it from the way in which they here speak of the Ecumenical assembly gathered round the tomb of St. Peter to take counsel on the spiritual and moral necessities of mankind in the present age, and the "perfidious machinations" against its sacred authority. It is a little curious, too, when we remember that most of these prelates signed the Fulda Pastoral of 1869, and many of the various protests of the minority at Rome, which may be seen in the second volume of Friedrich's *Documenta*, to find them speaking of Papal infallibility as a doctrine universally held in the middle ages, and the notion of its being dangerous to the State as a mere extravagance of party spirit and passion. Their grievance is, that Jesuits at Bonn and Breslau, who have been suspended for refusing the new dogmas, are upheld in their positions by the Government. The Emperor's reply to the bishops is more short than sweet. He expresses surprise at their using language calculated to shake the confidence of his Catholic subjects, and the more so as the Pope has hitherto freely acknowledged the just treatment accorded to the Church in Prussia. He denies that the Government has meddled with doctrinal controversies, or done more than its duty in seeking to avert the threatened conflict between Church and State, and refers them for a more detailed explanation to his Ministers. Meanwhile, whether his hopes of the harmonious co-operation of all in promoting the general interests of the newly established Empire are disappointed or not, he will continue as before to accord to every communion the fullest liberty consistent with the rights of others and their equality before the law. This answer, which is a pretty hard rap over the knuckles for the infallibilists, is said to have given very general satisfaction. Indeed it is remarkable that in a contested municipal election at Cologne the other day, where the contest became a trial of strength between the rival parties in the Church, the Old Catholic candidates were all elected over the heads of the Ultramontanes.

In Hungary the infallibilists have won what they may perhaps consider a triumph, though we suspect it is one of those victories which are gained at the expense of the winning side. Archbishop Haynald of Calocsa was one of the most outspoken and respected of the Opposition at the Vatican Council. It oozed out some two months ago that he had, under strong pressure, sent in a formal submission, couched indeed in language the reverse of complimentary, but containing the one talismanic formula which Rome requires and is content with. He did not, however, promulgate the decrees, as neither, with one exception, did the other Hungarian bishops. But he has found, like others, that there is no halting in the downward path; and accordingly the other day at a Diocesan Synod assembled in his cathedral city, he delivered his soul after a fashion most gratifying to his new associates. After a passing fling at the oppression of "a noble Catholic nation" by Protestant Prussia, and some very strong asseverations of the indispensable necessity of the Temporal Power for the proper discharge of the duties of the Papacy, he came to the "principal object" before the Synod, and belaboured the heads of those false Catholics who are "imperilling the unity of the Church and the salvation of souls" by rejecting the new dogma, with blows of the archiepiscopal crozier neither few nor light. Yet it was believed in Germany only a few weeks ago that he would rather resign his see than acknowledge the dogma himself. A writer in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* testifies to having heard from a Hungarian bishop, long after the Council, that Haynald was most vehemently opposed to submission; and only last September Dr. Michels visited him in the hope that he would place himself at the head of the Old Catholic movement. In a public session of the Catholic Congress of Hungary last year he declared that "on Papal infallibility any one was free to believe what he pleased." Now, however, he declares that, "as the Vatican decrees have been accepted by all the bishops of the Catholic world, with scarcely an exception, every Catholic, whatever his individual and scientific conviction may be, is bound to regard these doctrines as flowing from Christ through Peter, and to accept and follow them as such. In this sense he has himself surrendered his personal views to the judgment of the Church, and declared in Rome that he will teach the Vatican decrees, and have them taught by his clergy." He goes beyond Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis, who has announced his submission to the new dogma, but declares he will never again

enter his pulpit, as he cannot teach it. At the close of Haynald's address a titular bishop, Nehiba by name, stood up and declared in the name of the assembled clergy, who do not appear to have had any voice in the matter themselves, that they accepted and would teach the Vatican doctrines as articles of faith. And so the solemn farce was brought to a close, and the real contest in Hungary to a beginning. The Archbishop declared that the decrees were too well known already to require any special publication, the fact being that such publication is forbidden by the Government. It remains to be seen whether those clergy who refuse to accept them will be supported in their resistance by the Austrian, as by the Prussian and Bavarian Governments.

#### NAMES AND TITLES.

OF all Adam's gifts, the one which is most conspicuously lacking in his descendants is that of assigning names to things. It is an art gone from us. All names that please are lost in an impenetrable antiquity; there is no such thing as a new name; for the monstrous perpetrations of modern scientific nomenclature we decline to regard as names. How came flowers, animals, insects, men and women, mountains, peaks, islands, rivers, by the easy, expressive, distinctive titles we know them by; so that, in fancy at least, before we know the thing, we seem to know the group it belongs to? What figure would they all make if we had to name them now through the medium of a Parliamentary Commission? What should we call a rose, a violet, an apple, a lion, a tiger, an eagle, a snake, a spider, a butterfly? Could we even impart to the cabbage anything of the idea of bulk, roundness, and homely worth which its present sound suggests? Happily in these days we have only to name our babies, our books, and our streets; for we cheerfully leave science to work its will on the agencies of chemistry and electricity in conglomerations of syllables which the necessities of social life seldom call on us to pronounce. We cannot wholly escape the pains of inexorable classification, turning what is old and familiar into modern strangeness—the "Old Hundredth," for instance, into "Psalm cxxxvi.," but people need seldom use long words of any sort unless they like them, so there is not much to complain of. Besides, most people have that degree of pedantry in some pursuit or other that the use of a technical term flatters their self-respect. It is all very well to know the original clematis as "Virgin's Bower," but it comes in well also to recognise its newer cousin-german under the graceful distinction of "Jackmanii." We are not many of us like the naturalist who refused to adapt his large knowledge to the science of the day, and

Smiled to hear the creatures he had known  
So long were now in class and order shown,  
Genus and species. Is it meet, said he,  
This creature's name should one so sounding be?  
'Tis but a fly, though firstborn of the spring—  
Bombylius major, do you call the thing?  
Well, go thy way, for I do feel it shame  
To stay a being with so proud a name.

When we say that the invention of our day finds its most universal exercise in naming babies, it must be allowed that an absolutely new name is next to an impossibility. We cannot advise any exercise of ingenuity in this department, lest it should end in such eccentricities as we are all familiar with, but which it would be cruel to particularize. There is no greater injustice than the infliction of a whimsical or grotesque name on helpless infancy. Such caprice, to use the argument in Bret Harte's celebrated Idyl, "is playing it pretty low down on this yer baby." But we note a growing tendency to accumulate incongruous names; to overlay, so to say, the new-born treasure with the last novelties unearthed from chronicles and romance. Nor is the word "overlay" merely figurative, for it is from the obituary of the *Times* we form our surmise; and it does strike us that there are collocations of names, mouthfuls of consonants, that cannot be strung together promiscuously without fatal consequences to the bearer. It is in the more cheerful marriage column that we find the triumphs of modern art. The happy bride has appended to her baptismal name, which nobody is supposed to know, a certain inane baby sobriquet. Ma, or Minnie, or Ellie, or Emmie, or Evie, or Edie, follows in parenthesis for the world's enlightenment. If we must have diminutives, commend us to the old style—Sally, Polly, Dolly, Letty, Kitty—which need some practice in articulate sounds to pronounce; names with some sense and work in them.

Yet these harsher familiarities were a trial to their victims, as we learn from contemporary literature. Antiquity holds the grandest names in its keeping; these were sought out by romance writers, and became objects of longing and yearning to their readers. Bidly in the comedy would fain keep her name a secret, and groans over the homely pedigree, "her mother Bridget, her mother Margery, her mother Cicely, her mother Alice," and insists on being addressed as Parthenissa. Mrs. Delany's early biography is a curious confusion of Molls and Besses with a nomenclature borrowed from Madlle. de Scudéry and the playwrights, in which she and her friends disguised themselves. She is Aspasia, her uncle Alcandor; her fat, tipsy, odious old husband is Gromeo, his Cornish castle Averno; her friends are Fulvia and Stella; her would-be admirers Bassanio, Germanico, Honorius, and so on. It is the old story—the leaning towards homeliness, qualified by a wish to escape from it as a sort of indignity.



Miss Edgeworth has a story founded on this practice, where the heroine runs away from her guardians to seek her Angelina, and Mrs. Malaprop corresponds with Sir Lucius as Delia. The *Spectator* is peculiarly happy in both veins—the homely and the classic; and nobody knows till he tries how hard it is to be easy in such a slight matter as this. Few could hit off Addison's facile, tripping variety of signatures, so obvious many of them that they seem to have come of themselves. Rachel Welladay, with a heavy complaint; Barbara Crabtree, wanting to know if she may use a cudgel to her son of a husband; Jenny Simper, with her grievance of the overdecked church; Kitty Termagant, of the Romps' Club; Abraham Spy, on a new glass for the use of stargers; Anthony Gape, who had run his nose against a post; the hen-pecked Nathaniel Henroost; Tom Pottle, William Wiseacre, Fanny Fickle, who tell their own story, &c. Nor is he less lucky in classical terminations—Hecatiess, applying to be admitted into the Ugly Club; Tristissa, married to a fool, and so on. Contrast these with the heavy nomenclature of the *Rambler*; *Venusculus*, the coward; *Turpicula*, with crooked legs; *Flosculus*, the dresy man; *Chartophylax*, &c., and by contrast we recognise felicity in a branch of art.

We gather, indeed, that Addison's ear was especially fastidious on the subject of names. Speaking in the taste of the time, he remarks how much the proper name of one of our countrymen pulls down the language that surrounds it, and he finds this effect in some verses of *Chey Chase* which sound anything but mean in our ears. But that a proper name can do this disservice to turgid verse is true enough. Witness the following elegy on Dr. Small, from the pen of Dr. Darwin:—

Cold Contemplation leans her aching head,  
And as her human we her broad eye turns,  
Waves her meek hand, and sighs for Science dead,  
For Science, Virtue, and for Small she mourns.

All wit naturally exercises itself in giving names, and would-be wit does the same. Nothing is more awkward and disastrous than the efforts of some to be lively on their belongings. Effort in this direction is indeed always unfortunate. The nicknames of persons and things in some circles under the dominion of bad taste are a perpetual jar to their friends. But the knack of connecting themselves with their surroundings, as we see it in some ready wits, is not the less diverting. We inevitably think of some people as attended by a sort of equipage. Everything they possess is twice theirs by this method of appropriation. Of course the habit is a form of self-assertion; but we readily yield the homage which self-assertion looks for to anybody who amuses us. Sydney Smith was conspicuous in this line. Every person and thing about him bore the touch of his wand, from his horse Calamity to the emetic in his medicine-chest, Up-with-it-then.

No writer has been more successful in his nomenclature than Bunyan. What would the *Pilgrim's Progress* be with Greek or German substitutes—such names as satisfy modern allegory—for his Delectable Mountains; his Giant Despair; his Slough of Despond; his Much-afraid, Ready-to-Halt, By-ends, Maul, Great-Heart, Steadfast, My Lord Turn-Around, My Lord Time-Server, Mr. Facing-both-Ways, and the rest of that animated company. A good name comes with a flash; this is the secret of its success with us. No name in Bunyan is an after-thought. The quality, the Christian grace, the virtue, or the vice which he would impersonate takes form and name with him at the same instant of time. This happy fearlessness owes much, no doubt, to his ignorance of polite literature and canons of taste; he goes the straighter to his point, and is sublime or homely in equal unconsciousness. If his allegory wants a public-house sign, he puts the idea he would express in the most familiar form and language he can hit upon—"At the Sign of the Reprobate," or at the "Sign of the Conscience Seared with a Hot Iron"; because, under such influences, his sinner can sink from bad to worse with the greater and more intelligible precipitancy. But this style cannot be imitated without offence. By the width and daring of his range Bunyan has secured to himself in perpetuity the field of religious allegory in the English tongue.

Sir Walter Scott is great in his names; it is one of his specialties. Dr. Dryasdust is a classic. He has the art of giving an air of probability to a name full of meaning. Richie Monipplies, Dr. Heavysterne, Andrew Fairservice, especially when veiled in Scottish, tickle the air with a lasting relish. What does not his poetry owe to a felicitous rush of ordered names, as in *Marmion*, or the *Lord of the Isles*? or to the stately union of name and title in which his ear guides the pen so well. Names are much more things to some people than to others, and heraldry which embalms names is to such a language full of meaning. What a passion for the science is expressed in these sounding lines! a passion in which the reader cannot for the time help sympathizing:—

Still is thy name of high account,  
And still thy verse has charms,  
Sir David Lindsay of the Mount,  
Lord Lion-King-at-Arms.

Satire naturally expresses itself in nomenclature. Mr. Trollope's Dr. Filgrave is good, the lawyer Chaffanbrass is expressive, though a little too broad; but some of his lawyers' names have no affinity in sound to any possible English surname, and this is a mistake. Dickens's names are his own, which is the most that can be said of them. They express one vein of humour. It is extremely difficult to assign satisfactory names to creatures of the imagination. Swift succeeds in his Gulliver. The *Coming Race*,

for all the pains taken to ensure a right pronunciation, is dull in its names to our thinking; they don't stimulate or interest. People may be good writers and yet utterly miss the mark when thrown upon their invention for names out of the common way. Wilson, for example, in his lively critique on *Walton's Angler*, speaks of the "queer cits, with names as queer, each with his individual silliness"; names which balk every reader. There is unquestionably a luck in names; there is a success in satisfying the public ear which no rule can secure. Mrs. Gamp is a lucky name. If she had been Mrs. Chuzzlewit she would not have established herself in the English heart as she has done. Farquhar could never have expected his *Lady Bountiful* to live as a type as she has done. Simon Pure is another success, and people talk of the "real Simon Pure" who don't know where to look for his original. Paul Pry is another; but alliteration is the secret of a great deal of such fame. Then, again, flowers have their luck; asphodel, moly, and eglantine are talked of and lingered over by poets and readers who are utterly ignorant of what they are like.

If from names we come to titles, we note the same decadence, the same loss of knack, in authors and poets. And yet a title to a book is quite as important to its success as a name is to a Christian. Where in modern days do we find such harmonious felicities as *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Cynthia's Revels*, the *Faerie Queene*, the *Shepherd's Calendar*? or such stimulants to the reader as the *Anatomic of Melancholy*, the *Marriage Ring*, *Annus Mirabilis*, the *Tale of a Tub*, borrowed by Swift from Ben Jonson? Our more advanced poets affect contempt for the flattery of a fair name, as though it were paying court to ignorance or effeminacy. What a name has Mr. Browning chosen as the title of his latest poem and its heroine! and as for Mr. Clough, the poet who according to some American critics is to represent our poetry of the nineteenth century to the twentieth, the title of his largest work is simply Greek to the ordinary English reader, and is slurred over by him as any other long word is by a child of six. We are convinced that where titles are descriptive, and so are calculated to live in the memory, their composition was achieved in a different chronological order from our own. As they come first in the book, so they came first into the author's brain; as Bottom plans the title of his ballad before a line of it was in his head. Take, for instance, the titles we find in Wood's *Athens* of all the pamphlets of his busy day. *A Pair of Spectacles for Humphrey Lind!* The inventor would naturally write up to such a title. And so would the respondent to his, who retorts with *A Case for a Pair of Spectacles*. The polemic whose antagonist owned the name of Lazarus would unquestionably devise his title *Lazarus' Sores Licked* before he put pen to paper. And the enemy of an ordained ministry would start from his title as from a text, *A Winding-Sheet for England's Ministry, which has a Name to Live and is Dead*.

Shakspeare, great in everything, is great in names; as he has the widest circuit among men, women, and spirits, fanciful, historical, foreign, and English. How he would have relished thundering Greek we may gather from the half-banter of *Aeneas* asking—

Which is that god in office guiding men?  
Who is the high and mighty Agamemnon?

But he needed it not. Names were things to him. Our language is enriched with phrases which prove it. What a curious distinctness we gather from the words, "*Syllable men's names*"; and the poet's office is not only to localize what before was nothing, but to give it a name. These are not thoughts to come into modern poets' heads. They are more intent on proving the truth of Juliet's paradox, that the rose by any other name would smell as sweet; which Mr. Browning has literally tried to do, as we think with very ill success, in styling his little *Pomegranate Balaustion*.

#### THE BRITISH ARMY OF THE FUTURE.

FEW subjects are more worthy of thought and consideration than the prospects of the British army. Not only the profession itself, but also the public generally, is deeply interested in the matter. The old British army, which, whatever its faults, whatever its shortcomings, was second to none in gallantry, endurance, loyalty, patriotism, and a stern sense of duty, has been virtually swept away. The question is, What will be the nature and value of its successor? We can hardly say as yet that it has a successor, for the military revolution has been swift and sudden, and so rashly have the so-called reorganizers managed matters that they have destroyed the old before the arrangements for constructing a new army have been completed. Our military system is at the present moment in a state of transition; and though we may deplore the length of time which this transition period has lasted, and regret that a speedy termination is not probable, yet to a certain extent we find compensation in the fact that public opinion, expressed through the press and other channels, will be able to exercise a wholesome influence on the plans of the Government. The designs of the Ministry are only faintly shadowed forth; scarcely has one detail been carried into execution; hence the opportunity of checking, guiding, and modifying the current which has hitherto accomplished little beyond destruction.

The conditions of military service, both for officers and men, will in many respects be distinctly at variance with those which have hitherto prevailed. Our object now is to ascertain, as far as we can by means of the inductive process, what these conditions are

likely to be, and how far they will affect the efficiency of the army. Let us commence with the officers. It is the apparent object of the party now in power to render them more democratic, and for ulterior political views to weaken both the ties which unite officers with the Crown and their influence over the rank and file. To those who consider that the democratizing process is a panacea for all military deficiencies, we may reply by pointing to the results of the late war, in which the most democratic was annihilated by the most aristocratic of armies. On the other hand, the aristocratic army of Austria was in 1866 speedily crushed by the equally aristocratic army of Prussia. It is evident therefore that the efficiency of a military system is not necessarily affected by its aristocratic or democratic constitution, though experience teaches us that, *ceteris paribus*, a moderately aristocratic army is, generally speaking, superior to one which is democratic. It is too early to prognosticate with confidence to what extent the moderately aristocratic element will prevail in the British army under the new system. We are, however, disposed to think, for reasons which we shall set forth, that no great change, as regards the classes which have hitherto supplied our officers, will take place. There can be no doubt that the standard, both of general and professional knowledge, will be raised. If, however, it be suddenly raised, the concomitant advantages may be more than counterbalanced by disadvantages. It is hoped by the extreme Liberals that, by throwing open commissions to public and unrestrained competition, and by facilitating promotion from the ranks, many good men from the lower middle and upper lower classes of society will be induced to adopt the profession of arms. The result, say such men as Mr. Trevelyan, will be advantageous, inasmuch as it will widen the field for selection and competition. We are unable to endorse this view. In the first place, something more than mere book-learning—physical fitness, and steadiness of conduct—is required in officers; and, in the second place, we feel convinced that the attractions of a commission, dissociated as the latter must be from social position, if it be sought to carry out the experiment on a large scale, are not sufficient for the classes for whom the bait is set. The additional something we refer to is wanting in even the best members of the classes below the upper middle; it is a deficiency in tact, manner, and bearing, for which no mere educational proficiency can compensate. No men are more severe critics as regards manner and tact than soldiers, and they invariably render a more willing obedience to an officer of the upper classes, who is alike removed from their jealousy and accustomed to command, than to the promoted sergeant, or the lowly-born man, who has sometimes contrived without other than barrack-yard qualifications to obtain a commission. The soldier has been accustomed all his life to the superiority of the higher classes; the orders of one of the latter are therefore, apart from military discipline, instinctively obeyed. On the other hand, those of lower birth have to maintain a constant struggle with envy, sometimes mixed with a contempt born of comparison between the two classes of officers. Of course there are some men, even in the lowest strata of society, who have a natural genius for command, and by dint of combined talent and conduct win unqualified respect. Such men may with advantage be encouraged to aspire for commissions, provided that they possess, or are capable of acquiring, all the qualifications for a commission. A mere professional examination will never, however, test these qualifications, and steadiness is not the only complement to mere routine knowledge of routine military duties.

The hope of a commission, either by open competition, or by passing through the ranks, will, we believe, attract few of those whom the Radicals seek to enclose in their net. The pay is inferior to that which is to be obtained in civil pursuits without the sacrifice of personal liberty demanded by the army. Moreover, under the new state of things, a civil will far more surely than a military career lead to social advancement. These considerations lead us to believe that we shall continue as heretofore to draw our officers from the upper classes, but that we shall not obtain from them the same description of men as formerly. In one respect there will be an improvement. Up to the present time few, save those possessed of a certain amount of private fortune, have cared to seek for commissions, owing to the large sums required to be sunk both on entering the army and on subsequent promotion. This obstacle has been swept away, and many sons of clergymen, country gentlemen of small estates, professional men, and officers of the army and navy will enter, seeing that they will only require an annual allowance to enable them to remain in what has up till now been considered a *profession de luxe*. Most of these will be valuable acquisitions, and, if only on their account, we rejoice at the abolition of purchase. Under any circumstances, the army can never be a remunerative profession. Hence it will be only a strong and decided love of the career of arms which will lure such men from more profitable pursuits. Let us now consider how the change of system will affect those who now hold commissions. Among them are many sons of merchants, and even rich shopkeepers, who are put into the army for reasons similar to those which have caused them to be sent to Eton or Harrow—namely, that they might form eligible acquaintances, and acquire a higher social position than that to which by birth they are entitled. The lads themselves are actuated partly by the same motives as those which have influenced their parents, partly also by a desire to escape from the drudgery of a business life. They look forward to the pleasures of a mess, to the delight of wearing a showy uniform,

and to the charms of having, as they imagine, little to do—at all events, nothing requiring intellectual exertion. The large majority of such men are to be found in cavalry, and especially heavy cavalry, regiments. They have no real love for the profession, no ambition to distinguish themselves in it, merely make a convenience of it, and quit it for the most trivial reasons, on the slightest pretexts. A long purse will no longer secure rapid advancement. Continual, though not very severe, study will be the normal occupation of the British officer. Hence we anticipate that the rich *roturiers* will in future eschew the army, which will certainly not suffer from their absence.

As to the aristocracy and squirearchy, we are much mistaken if they do not furnish as many recruits as formerly; but perhaps they will be of a different description. Many good families now put their sons into commercial houses. Their number will probably increase till, as in Genoa of old, merchant and aristocrat will almost become convertible terms. The change in our military system will, we fear, increase the volume of the stream now flowing in that direction. The clever hardworking son of the squire or peer will be apt to say, If I have good abilities, and if I am to cultivate them, it will be wise for me to avoid the army—there labour will bring but slow and comparatively trifling returns—and to go into business, where, with little more work than is required to make an accomplished soldier, and without the disadvantages of Colonial service, I may look forward to the highest prize. Consequently, the best of the upper classes will no longer, as a rule, seek for commissions. We shall also, it may be feared, lose the second best—namely, the high-spirited lad who possesses no more education than can be picked up by the average student at Eton or Harrow, who, though clever, prefers out-of-door pursuits to sedentary occupation, and can only be induced to learn that which appears to him of practical and immediate profit. Both these sections may be retained if we avoid riding the hobby of military education to death, and remember what it is we really want in the regimental officer. We require that his general education should be equal to that of barristers and doctors, and that, in addition to the routine knowledge of his profession, he should be able to fortify a post, to draw a rough sketch of the same, or of a road, and should be acquainted with military, not Judge Advocate's law. By the way, the simplification and condensation of our military code are loudly demanded, and would much lighten the labours of young officers. For other duties than those we have enumerated we should go to the Royal Engineers, the Staff College, and men who have made military law their special study. We are at present showing an inclination to demand more than we really require, and are practically endeavouring to make all regimental officers accomplished engineers, skilled military draughtsmen, and finished tacticians. The result is, that they will ere long possess only a smattering, painfully acquired, of many things virtually almost useless to them. If we moderate our aspirations, we may still retain and attract the two sections of the upper classes adverted to. If we do not, we shall have to fall back on the steady, industrious, but not over clever, section composed of men well born, and of independent means, not averse to sedentary pursuits, but endowed with so little talent that success in a commercial career would be hopeless. Such bemuddled book-worms would, though more full of technical knowledge than the present officers, be far inferior to them as soldiers.

Let us now turn to the rank and file, and with regard to them we are even less sanguine than as to the officers. We fear that we shall in future obtain a class of recruits very inferior to those who formerly took the shilling. Mr. Cardwell has spoken with exultation of the excellent nature of the raw material which he has been able to collect; but all experienced soldiers know that of late years the army has greatly deteriorated, and that trustworthy efficient non-commissioned officers are more rare than formerly. We need not mention all the causes which have led to this result: to one, however, we will call attention. This is, the continual changes which have lately taken place with regard to the conditions of service. These conditions are now again in process of being altered, and we confess that we are apprehensive of the consequences. Short service with no pension undoubtedly possesses certain advantages, but these are more than counterbalanced by disadvantages. Our army reserve is a good thing in itself, but the measure applied as we apply it is positively hurtful. We shall have a growing reserve, but we have devised no machinery for ensuring that the men composing it shall be immediately available, and quickly incorporated in permanent regiments when danger threatens. A short service of three years with which we are threatened, or even a service of six years, which has been actually introduced, may result in permeating the population with a military leaven, but it will accomplish that object at the expense of the active army. Captain Laymann, of the Prussian army, tells us in his able pamphlet about tactics, that moral force "will be found most certainly and uniformly in regular armies composed of troops which have passed through a certain period of service." His reason for arriving at this conclusion is, that to make training efficient, it is necessary to continue it until "the spirit of discipline has penetrated into and become a part of the man's nature." In saying this, we must of course not be understood as offering an opinion adverse to a system of army reserves, but only as protesting against its abuse. We suspect that short service is injurious to recruiting; that is to say, to the recruiting of good men. A man worth enlisting, i.e.—the thoughtful, steady man, who is



prepared to devote himself to the military service of his country—looks to permanent employment, followed by an adequate pension. In the army, as elsewhere, certain and prolonged employment, with prospects at the close of it, involves lower wages than for short or casual labour. This fact does not seem to be recognised by Mr. Cardwell. He fancies that long service is gallant; whereas it is a fact well known to soldiers that the majority of men, when they take the shilling, do not trouble themselves with thinking whether the service is to be for six years or sixteen. Of the two, the best men, as we have pointed out, often prefer the sixteen. The restless men, who might prefer the shorter period, are always the worst soldiers. Take men who volunteer from one regiment to another as instances. They are almost always indifferent and troublesome soldiers. The really good soldier looks on the regiment as his home; he will soldier in his own corps, or nowhere else; his comrades are his family, and he knows and becomes attached to the officers, who return his feelings towards them. From this proceed *esprit de corps* and tactical coherence, both of which are in danger of being swept away by the present system. We are, therefore, induced to believe that the better class of peasant—the very flower of our army—will enlist in smaller numbers than formerly. As to the inducements to enlist, offered by the chance of a commission, we doubt their power. We have already shown that to the clever ambitious lad of the upper, lower, and middle classes a commission would be but an unsubstantial prize. If, however, a different idea became prevalent, surely such a man would prefer open competition to a painful qualification obtained by passing through the ranks. Our impression is that the great mass of recruits will henceforth be composed of men little better than loafers—idle, shiftless, restless fellows who will be attracted by short service, which moreover many of them will shorten by desertion. Such are the men who fill the ranks of Militia regiments; and such are the men whom it is anything but desirable to have in our active army.

As to the future relations of officers and men, the subject is not one which we can discuss in the few lines left at our disposal. We fear, however, that, owing to the short service of the men, and the constant changes among the officers, there will be a great falling off in that respect. The link which bound them together formerly will henceforth be loose indeed. The officers will be looked on by the men as foremen rather than as feudal superiors, and the men will be viewed by the officers as journeymen rather than as comrades. This alteration, with the consequent diminution of the influence of the officers, may render the army less formidable to violent Radicals, but it will also render it less formidable to the foe; and what wise man blunts his knife for fear it should cut his own finger?

#### THE OPENING OF THE SWISS FEDERAL ASSEMBLY.

IN speaking of Swiss matters, whether political or antiquarian, we have always to renew our old complaint that Englishmen as a rule wilfully shut their eyes to them. No country is more visited by Englishmen than Switzerland; no country is richer in political phenomena than that where the oldest and the newest forms of political life may be seen working side by side. Yet most Englishmen seem to be rather proud of knowing every peak and pass in the country, while they think it below them to ask a single question about what is going on among the men of the country. We found a curious proof of this the other day. We stumbled on a number or two of a paper called the *Swiss Times*, published at Geneva, seemingly for the benefit of English visitors. The Swiss Federal Assembly had just met for what cannot fail to prove its most important Session since the establishment of the present Federal Constitution in 1848. But to such a matter as this the *Swiss Times*, a paper published in the country, did not devote a single line. Now we can hardly fancy that a French or German paper published in England would take no notice whatever of the beginning of a new Session of Parliament, especially if the Session were likely to be occupied by a Reform Bill. In no part of Europe is there busier political life than in Switzerland, in no part is there more diligent historical research. But the mass of Englishmen agree to pass by both, as if the land contained only mountains and were barren of men. To the ordinary English tourist we presume that it never occurs that there are such beings as Swiss statesmen and scholars. But Swiss statesmen and scholars there are in abundance, and it certainly does not raise Englishmen in their eyes to find a land which is truly the schoolroom of Europe looked upon only as its playground.

The two Councils which form the Swiss Federal Assembly, the *Ständerath* or Council of the States (answering to the American Senate) and the *Nationalrath* (answering to the American House of Representatives) are now assembled to discuss the great question of a reform in the Federal Constitution. Such a reform has to be made by a vote of the two Councils, further confirmed by a twofold vote of the people—a real *plebiscitum* as distinguished from the Bonapartist sham—voting both as a nation and in their Cantons. Schemes for a reform in the Constitution have been about for several years, and in 1866 several amendments actually passed the Councils; but all were rejected by the popular vote, except one which extended political rights to the Jews. The Assembly has at this moment before it three sets of proposals, from Committees of the two branches of the Assembly itself and

also from the Executive Government, the *Bundesrath* or Federal Council. Besides these, there are the various proposals of individual members, and the demands or petitions made at various public meetings in different parts of the country. The newspapers of which every part of Switzerland is so full naturally have their say also, and pamphlets have appeared, some of them from writers whose names command attention, at all events within the bounds of the Confederation. There is one from the pen of the famous James Fazy of Geneva, who has lately been returned to the *Ständerath* as a representative of his own Canton, while another, though anonymous, is universally ascribed to the veteran Federal Councillor, Dubs. Altogether there is no lack of political stir in the land just at this time when tourists most likely think that Switzerland, like some of her own animals, goes altogether into a state of winter sleep. The traveller on the other hand who has had the good luck to be present at the opening of the Federal Assembly, and to have the privilege of conversing with men of political experience in the country, will look at things in another light.

We hope, as the discussion goes on and shows some signs of the way in which matters are likely to be settled, to go a little more fully into some of the points in debate. At present we purpose only to point out in a very general way the nature of some of the questions which are now occupying the public mind of the Confederation, and to put on record the impressions of an English political student on the appearance and ways of going on of the Assembly itself.

It is to be supposed that the most ordinary visitor to Bern has seen the outside of the *Bundespalast*, the seat of the Federal Government and of the Federal Assembly. It is of course quite possible that he may not have asked its object; or perhaps the use of the word *Palast* or *Palais* may have misled him. Chief Justice Whiteside, who believed Switzerland to be "a confederation of small kingdoms," no doubt set the building down as the dwelling-place of the King of Bern. Still, as its immediate neighbourhood commands one of the finest views of the Bernese mountains, every one must have seen the building itself. Some—though we believe that it is contrary to rule to think of such matters in Switzerland—may even have given a thought to its peculiar architecture, neither Gothic nor Palladian, but Italian in the better sense, Pisan, Luchese, whatever we choose to call it. Of that building the middle portion is occupied by the various offices of the Federal Government, where the President and other members of the Federal Council discharge the functions of the Executive Government with the smallest possible amount of external parade. The traveller who has an ordinary introduction may go and knock at the official door of a Swiss Minister of State with as little ceremony as if he were knocking at the door of a friend in college rooms. The two wings are set apart for the meetings of the two Chambers of the Federal Assembly, the *Nationalrath* on the right, and the *Ständerath* on the left. The important Session which is now going on was opened by both Chambers on Monday, November 6, and the proceedings in both branches of the Legislature were of a kind to be deeply interesting to any observant Englishmen, if only on account of their utter contrast to the manners and customs of both Houses of his own Parliament. We were a little amused on making this remark to a passing traveller, who made the ready answer, "I suppose the republicans are much more free and easy than we are." On the other hand, what most strikes an English spectator is the extreme and almost prudish decorum with which the republicans carry on the work of legislation. As we heard an eminent Swiss statesman remark, "It is like being in church." To be sure the Presidential office in either Council altogether lacks those outward appurtenances of dignity which surround an English Speaker or Lord Chancellor with such a mysterious greatness. Switzerland stands in no fear of any Cromwell or Bonaparte rising within her own bosom; but at all events, if any usurper should ever arise to tell either House of the Federal Assembly that the Lord hath done with them, he could at least not add the command to take away any baubles. No mace lies either above or below the table, indeed no table in the English sense can be said to be there at all. No flowing robes, no massive periwig, mark off the President of either Council from his brethren. Still less need we look for the presence of the elders of either of the two great religious communions which divide the Confederation, though the contrast of Catholic and Protestant ecclesiastics in their several official costumes might be even more striking than our own spectacle of an array of rochets and chimeres among a body of gentlemen in ordinary dress. But, on the other hand, there is something to be said for the republican Assembly even in point of outward dignity. Neither of the Swiss Councils presents the sight of a number of gentlemen with their hats on, jolling easily on benches, and chattering familiarly with each other while the affairs of the nation are debating. First of all, each House has ample room for the members of each, not only in the smaller Assembly of the *Ständerath*, but in the far larger body of the *Nationalrath*. Every member has his own place, his own armchair and desk, the seats ranging like those of a theatre round the places of the President and other official personages. In the *Nationalrath* the President is supported on either hand by his Vice-President and by the Chancellor of the Confederation, the veteran Herr Schüss. Beyond the Chancellor sits the official translator, whose business it is, in a trilingual Assembly, to render the official utterances made in one tongue into the tongues understood of other members. In front of these officers, and in face of the House in general, is the table occupied by the four official tellers, members of the House

formally chosen for that purpose, who discharge the functions which among ourselves fall to the lot of personal zeal or of unrecognised office. The rest of the House is filled by the chairs of the members, occupied without any distinction of Canton or party. A Conservative speech may be answered by a Radical member sitting close by; and, what strikes an Englishman still more, a German speech may be answered by a speech in French, or *vice versa*. Italian, as the tongue of the Canton of Ticino, is equally recognised by the laws of the Confederation; but it is naturally in the two great tongues of the country, the German speech of the old Confederates and the Romance of the newer Burgundian Cantons, that the debates are almost wholly carried on. The speeches are short, lively, and, as far as we could judge, commonly to the point, the French speakers, as a rule, using, as might be looked for, more of animated gesture than the Germans. But what amazes an insular visitor more than all is that the speeches are always received without any expressions of feeling one way or another. No one cheers; still less does any one cry "Oh, oh." Either practice is, in Swiss etiquette, looked on as unparliamentary. We suspect indeed that in Switzerland, as well as in England and America, members do now and then speak to Buncombe, or, as we should perhaps rather say, to Gersau or Zollikofen. Certainly some members clearly commanded the ear of the House far more fully than others. Still even those who were most likely speaking to distant constituents met with no kind of interruption. Instead of the buzz of talk which greets the oratory of such men among ourselves, the only sign of inattention was that the other members betook themselves to their desks and read or wrote like Cato the Younger. Only a few speeches were read, but among them was the opening speech of the President of the *Ständerath*. The Swiss Constitution gives no opportunity for either a King's Speech or a President's Message. The proceedings of each Council are therefore opened by an address from its own chosen President, who sets before the House the circumstances under which the Session begins, and the nature of the measures which are likely to be brought forward. We may add that the public is freely admitted to the galleries—the "tribunes"—of both Houses. As far as we have seen, the attendance was moderate, neither disappointingly thin nor unpleasantly crowded, and the behaviour of those who looked on from above was as orderly as that of the legislators themselves below. Where the members themselves do not venture to express their own likes and dislikes, it would need uncommon hardihood in the general public to do so.

And now for a very slight account of some of the questions which are brought, or are likely to be brought, before what can hardly fail to prove this memorable Assembly. The tendencies of Swiss politics just now look towards the more direct exercise of political power by the people at large, and towards the further transfer of power from the Cantons to the Confederation at large. The first tendency, it will be seen, has no connexion with the Federal nature of the Swiss Constitution; it might arise under any Government of a popular kind. The other class of questions could of course arise only in a Federal State. The strong Conservative feeling of several of the Cantons—among them, be it observed, some of those whose Constitution is most purely democratic—their tenacious clinging to old, possibly antiquated, institutions and usages, seems to have driven the advanced Liberal party in Switzerland into a position distinctly hostile to the principle of State sovereignty. One is almost appalled when one reads of a large meeting, in which several members of the Cantonal Government of Zürich took a part, in which resolutions were passed in favour of the abolition of the *Ständerath* and of the popular vote of the Cantons in constitutional amendments. This really comes very near to a change of the Confederation into a consolidated State. It would take away from Cantons as Cantons any voice in Federal legislation, and would make everything depend on a numerical majority in the *Nationalrath* and in the nation. Such an extreme measure as this is hardly likely to be adopted, but there are points in which a strengthening of a Federal power, or at all events a settling by Federal legislation of some points which are now within the competence of the Cantons, is earnestly called for, and we may add is decidedly needed. Some change must be made in the law of *Niederlassung* or *Etablissement*, some change which may get rid of the trammels by which, in several Cantons, a citizen of another Canton is dealt with in purely local matters as if he were a foreigner. And it may be hoped that some measures may be taken for extending the powers of the supreme Federal Court. Nothing in the Swiss system seems more strange to a spectator of any other nation than the custom by which appeals from the Cantonal authorities, appeals in many cases of a purely judicial kind, are carried not to the Federal Court, but to the Federal Council—that is, to the Executive Government—and from thence, by a further appeal, to the Federal Assembly, that is, to the two Houses of Parliament.

Both on these subjects, and also on the great constitutional change by which it is proposed to give to the people the same voice in ordinary Federal legislation which they now possess only in the case of a constitutional amendment, we hope to speak more at large when the time is come to say something as to the results of the Session. As far as we can see, the *Veto* and the *Referendum*, the proposed reference, either as a matter of course or in certain specified cases, of all Federal legislation, including even treaties with foreign countries, to a popular vote of *Yea* or *Nay*, is not greatly dreaded by men who have experience in Swiss politics. It may degenerate into a burdensome or empty formality, it may now and then hinder the passing of a good measure, but it cannot do any

active mischief. On the other hand, the *Volkssinitiative* by which the Legislature may be constrained by pressure from without to action on a particular point, seems to be looked on as really dangerous. For our own part we shrink from either proposal, as a distinct appeal from the better instructed to the less. We can hardly bring ourselves to believe that the mass of any nation can be fit to be trusted with such a direct exercise of power. But most certainly, if any nation can be so trusted, it is the Swiss who can.

#### ENGLISH CHARITIES.

ONE of the first things which we are wont, with characteristic modesty, to impress upon foreigners is the variety and extent of our charitable institutions. It is probable that, if our admiring visitors were in a position to make a candid investigation of the subject, they would find that neither the one nor the other is creditable to us. No doubt our charities are numerous, but their very number is a witness to our English love of blundering. Year by year we are wasting money and effort to an extent perfectly incalculable, for want of some consolidating power which should merge into one the various charities whose objects are identical or similar, and should destroy the starveling associations whose incomes show hardly any balance when the working expenses have been paid. In advocating a policy of consolidation, we do not allude to charities whose objects are distinctly religious, because into these the theological feeling enters, and it is hopeless to look for a fusion of the different parties who make up what is so strangely called the "religious world," and who discern in the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee an *articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesie*. Neither are we advocating the establishment, for example, of a central hospital or dispensary on a gigantic scale, when it is obviously desirable that such institutions should be planted freely in the midst of the population which needs them. We also put aside those charities which, possessing large endowments, become the objects of governmental care, and in whose administration jobbery, if it is not rendered impossible, will at least be limited to what we may call the privileged classes among jobbers. But, excluding these, we come to the countless charitable associations, each with its own machinery and officers, its own committees, its special elections, diverting needlessly a vast proportion of their income from the special objects at which they aim, and whose numbers produce no appreciable result beyond deceiving foreigners and confusing ourselves. We have no accurate knowledge of the number of existing societies for educating children, whether orphans or others, or for sheltering the blind, the idiot, and the like; their name is legion; their officers are legion also. If they were reduced in number and consolidated, their efficiency would be increased, and the cost of their executive would be proportionately decreased. Of course we have no hope of seeing a reform so desirable brought about in our day; we are a free people, and we are a charitable people, and when we give our money we like to see something for it, and that something means blundering and extravagance. To the uninitiated the very origin of these societies, however desirable the objects which they propose, is mysterious. The public, and especially the charitable public, is not by nature a compact body under discipline and management; it is made up of units; and who is the magician who inspires these units with a common enthusiasm, and welds them into an organized whole? The man is found when the hour comes; the scattered elements are gathered together, and he who so summons them dubs himself their secretary; and so long as men, blessed with leisure and a capacity for spending a larger income than they at present enjoy, see their way to making snug offices for themselves by establishing new charitable associations, we shall expect to see embryo secretaries multiplying such organizations *ad libitum*.

If, acknowledging their number, not as a creditable thing but as an evil too powerful for us to grapple with, we turn to the amount of our charities, and if by the side of the aggregate sums contributed we could set down in language as plain and intelligible as columns of £ s. d. a detail of the varied machinery and devices which are used to pump up the streams of so-called bounty from the depths of British pockets, we should say less about British benevolence for the future. It is confessedly a difficult problem; it has never been solved; but meanwhile the attempted solutions have introduced a large amount of blundering. On the one hand there are numberless cases calling for the exercise of benevolence—cases which can never be treated by the State, and with which we hope the State will never meddle. Professional men fall out in the race of life when their powers seemed to be in full vigour, and leave a family with insufficient means and with education incomplete; or there are professional men, especially among the underpaid clergy—not the least deserving members of their class—who are unable without help to educate their children; there are also hosts of afflicted people who will never make their way in the world; to say nothing of those who have seen better days, and find themselves at length without resources and unable to work. No system of political economy can ever provide for these numerous but exceptional cases, and it must be that these weaker members of society have a claim of some sort on the stronger. There are, and for the credit of human nature we hope there always will be, persons who will recognise this claim, not merely because their organs of benevolence are largely developed, but from higher and better motives. The spring of such persons' bounty wells up spon-



taneously, and needs no machinery to raise it, although it may be better for guidance when raised. Shall we say that ten per cent. of our charities accrues thus spontaneously? We believe the estimate to be a very liberal one; we are but human, and to devote spontaneously to charity a fair proportion of our income denotes an almost superhuman moral organization. To atone for our deficiencies there will always be found persons who will attempt to solve the problem, and to bring together the claims of the needy and our undrained pockets. To apply the latter to the former, hosts of well-intentioned people are devoting the utmost ingenuity; and in proportion as we sympathize with these excellent persons, we regret to think that their task is daily becoming more difficult as charities multiply and devices become stale.

Foremost among such devices is the old-fashioned "charity sermon," which, we are glad to think, is almost obsolete. It is a creditable circumstance that in the present day, when there are probably more good preachers than ever were contemporary before, sermons themselves are thought less of, and church-goers have learned to regard churches as something better than preaching-houses; and we trust the day is coming when people will be able to go to church and to retire before the sermon begins, without being considered insulting to the preacher. As such a feeling gathers strength, it is obvious that charity sermons must rapidly become out of date, and we think it well that they should. The whole business is surrounded by an atmosphere of unreality. If a clergyman thinks it right to ask his people to give money to a hospital or to schools, or to any object whatsoever, he may be presumed to have made inquiries into the merits and needs of the charity before he becomes sponsor for it, and the information so acquired he can easily communicate to his congregation; but to do so would, under the present system, ensure failure. Some Boanerges must be brought from a distance to proclaim the praises of an institution of which perhaps he never heard until he was primed with the statistics which form his brief. The people love to have it so; but meanwhile the dodge has been worked at such high pressure that congregations accustomed to stimulants require stronger stimulants every year. Already a preacher who has not cultivated the arts of a Methodist revival is voted tame, perspiration is considered the infallible and only token of inspiration, and the time seems to be at hand when to be a negro, or to lie under a suspicion of heresy, will be the only credentials of a popular preacher.

But there are worse and more barefaced schemes for carrying out the maxim, *Rem, quocunque modo rem*. When will the public conscience and the public common sense rebel against the dreary ordeal of the charity dinner, with its titled chairman, its fussy stewards—whose mental calibre may be gathered from the fact of their paying for the questionable honour of their office—its prosy speeches, its bad wine, its professional singers with their "Non nobis," its self-laudation and mutual admiration? Such a function is a weariness to all concerned, and will soon, we hope, be banished to the limbo of exploded shams. Charity balls will have a longer reign; however absurd the connexion of ideas, a ball is a ball under any circumstances, and so long as there are girls ready to dance on the slightest provocation, we fear that their elders will be obliged to patronize such entertainments, and occasionally in the supposed interest of charity. We have no objection to balls *per se*, and we do not attempt with Mr. Spurgeon to lay down any limits within which they shall be accounted harmless; but we do strongly object to the delusion that when young people dance all night for their own gratification, they are practising the grace of charity, and are assisting a hospital for cripples who cannot dance, because a fraction of the cost of their tickets will ultimately find its way into the exchequer of such an institution. Still more indefensible are fancy bazaars; they are less honest; they are more comprehensive, and are patronized often by strict people who are horrified at the notion of a ball, and who have always a store of "wooleries" and unsubstantial nick-nacks ready to be launched into the next charitable swindle; at the same time they are more prolific in opportunities of flirting, and are simply gatherings at which young women, generally correct and modest, assail the opposite sex in the boldest manner, and demand extortionate prices for worthless trifles in the name of charity. We sympathize neither with the Dorcas who get up these swindles in the name of charity, nor with the fast maidens who, in the same name, lend themselves as privileged shopwomen, and abuse their privilege by unlimited flirting.

Our instances have gone on an ascending scale of badness. There remains yet another, and the worst—it is the modern subscription list, and the manner in which it is studied. If persons are convinced that it is a good thing to subscribe, for instance, to an idiot asylum, why cannot they give their money and have done with it, without receiving an equivalent in the shape of votes proportionate to the number of guineas subscribed? Patronage so insignificant gives infinite trouble both to patrons and to applicants. It deluges the former with circulars, which, although they immediately go into the waste-paper basket, have a savour that is grateful to the British snob, while it entails great expense on the latter, who are never in a position to bear it. Nothing could be easier than to assign to some independent body the task of selecting the most deserving cases; but, alas! if this were done, subscriptions would inevitably fall off, so few are the persons who will give their money without having a voice in the spending of it. The result of the present system is that not the case that most needs help, but the case that has secured the largest number of canvassers, wins the day. Worse remains; a diligent worry-

ing of subscribers has been carried on for months; at length the day of election arrives, the champions meet, voting-papers are handed in, the poll is diligently posted up, and a few votes on either side will turn the scale. The benevolence of the company is not limited to the present election; each member of it is in possession of proxies for all manner of elections, and each is anxious to do a stroke of business for a future "event." It is astonishing how the love of gambling and book-making pervades the gravest assemblies; the trade commences vigorously, and a slang savouring of the Stock Exchange becomes general. "Orphans" are "swopped" for "idiots," "idiots" for "cripples," "cripples" for "blinds," and "blinds" for "orphans"—so the business is carried on. All the while perhaps the most urgent cases are lying in want and suffering, debarred for ever from the benefits of the charity which they need, because they have never been ticketed "so interesting," and made the hobby of some old women of either sex.

Let us confess it. English charity, however vast in amount, is given without reflection, on impulse, or because other people are giving. The *Times* takes up a particular charity, and straightway it becomes the rage to support it, and money flows in until people are requested to hold their hands. Thus more than 250,000*l.* was subscribed last year to the Fund for the Sick and Wounded French and Germans. It was the fashion to give, and we sincerely hope that the contributors to that fund are now enjoying the reward of acquitted consciences, and are satisfied with the way in which their money was administered. At the same time it is well to note that this liberality was not over and above the ordinary bounty of Englishmen; but every home charity suffered, and probably the aggregate given was little, if at all, above the average of former years. The donors whose names were paraded in the daily papers got the full measure of glory; the real donors were existing charities whose resources were mulcted of the amount so diverted. To return to the thought with which we commenced; when next a foreign guest compliments us on the number and extent of our charities, it will be no false modesty but simple truth if we deprecate his admiration and say, "My dear sir, you notice the number of our charities; they are numerous indeed; but it would be more creditable if four out of every five were absorbed into one, for we are only working a machinery out of all proportion to our needs or to our results; and as to the amount of our charities, while perhaps one-tenth is given voluntarily and on principle, the rest is raised by a system of incessant touting and begging, by giving to people, in return for their money, pleasure, dignity, importance, and patronage, which frequently destroy the very object of our charity, and deprive the most deserving people of the assistance which they need."

#### TRIBUNALS OF COMMERCE.

THE further Report of the Judicature Commission which was confidently expected some months ago has not yet appeared, and it is understood that on one or two points considerable difference of opinion exists among the Commissioners. Meanwhile a Select Committee of the House of Commons has recommended the establishment of an entirely new set of Courts, under the title of Tribunals of Commerce. The Report containing this recommendation was drafted by a member of the Government; but it may be assumed that it embodies only his own individual opinion and that of the Committee, and that nothing will be done to carry it into effect until some agreement has been arrived at in regard to the general judicial organization of the country. The Treasury has been sufficiently taxed of late years to provide pensions and compensations for judicial officers whose services have been dispensed with, and it is not desirable that new offices should be created until it is decided what shall be done with those already in existence. It appears from the evidence taken by Mr. Ayrton's Committee that mercantile men are very much dissatisfied with the manner in which commercial cases are treated by the Superior Courts. This dissatisfaction is ascribed to the following causes—the expense and slowness of the proceedings, the difficulty of bringing the real question in dispute before the Court in a satisfactory manner, the frequent inability of the Court to try the cause, and the inefficiency, delay, and expense of the arbitration to which it is then remitted. In many cases, as, for example, in the case of perishable goods, or of a shipping dispute, where the witnesses are apt to be dispersed, it is essential that the evidence should be collected as soon as the controversy arises. It may be admitted that much discontent prevails among the commercial classes on this subject, and also that there are substantial grounds for discontent; but we cannot agree with the Committee that it was unnecessary to ascertain in what manner this feeling had grown up, and that it was enough to know that it existed, and was based on an "experience of practical results." It might as reasonably be argued that it is enough for a doctor to know that his patient is quite sure that he has a pain in his stomach, and that he should at once prescribe for him, without wasting time in inquiring into the patient's diet and mode of life. Between the demonstration that the Superior Courts do not give satisfaction and the proposal to establish another set of Courts of a novel character there is a great gap which requires to be filled up. It is possible that the commercial community may itself be in fault rather than the Superior Courts, or that the defects in the latter can be remedied. There can be no doubt that

the practice of referring to arbitration cases which have been prepared for trial in Court involves a great waste both of time and money, that the arbitration is sometimes carelessly and inefficiently conducted, and that the decisions thus obtained do not carry with them the same authority as if they had been pronounced from the Bench. This practice, however, arises in a great measure from the simple fact that the Courts have more business to dispose of than, under present arrangements, they can overtake; and it is conceivable that, by a reform of the Circuit system, or by an increase in the staff of Judges, the difficulty might be met without multiplying the number of tribunals.

It may be true that the public is bound to provide suitors with the means of obtaining judicial decisions in a simple manner and at moderate charges; but, on the other hand, people are also bound to conduct their business in such a way as to avoid, as far as possible, the necessity of appealing to the law to loosen knots which ought never to have been tied. We gather from the evidence that the Chambers of Commerce throughout the country have been for some time greatly exercised on this subject, and have devised a number of pretty schemes for a new set of Courts, or tribunals, as, in their grand way, they prefer to call them. It is amazing that it should never have occurred to shrewd intelligent men of business that it is within the power of the commercial classes to do a great deal to help themselves in this matter, and in a very obvious and simple manner, without the aid of any new Acts of Parliament, new Judges, or new tribunals. Bradford and Halifax appear to be the chief seats of the agitation for the newfangled Courts. These towns are also the chief seats of the wool trade, and this is how, according to one of the witnesses, men do business there:—"A man goes into a wool-stapler's warehouse, or meets him on 'Change, and he makes his bargain for hundreds or thousands; and there is no evidence whatever, and, not being able to establish it by *visd voce* evidence, if you have to appeal to the Law Courts, of course you fail to get redress." Here we have the President of a Chamber of Commerce—and he is no doubt a very fair type of the sort of people who preside over and compose Chambers of Commerce—who thinks there must be something seriously wrong with the Superior Courts because they will not give redress to a man who has no evidence to offer in support of his claim except his own assertion, and who has deliberately put himself in this position by neglecting the obvious and simple precaution of carrying a pen and a bit of paper, and making a note of his contract, or having it written out afterwards. Although wool is scarcely ever sold by written contract, yarn is sold in the same markets by a verbal contract in the first instance, which is the same day reduced to writing and confirmed. Would anything very dreadful happen, would the wool trade instantly collapse, and Halifax and Bradford vanish like a dream, if wool were to be sold in the same rational and business-like manner as yarn? Again, at Bradford it is the common practice for a manufacturer of textile fabrics to contract for warps without making any stipulation as to weight or the number of ends, so that the weight and number of ends of the warp as it is delivered vary with the market price, being more or less as the price rises or falls. As this is the custom, it has doubtless some practical convenience to recommend it; but if it leads to disputes, it is surely more reasonable that the manufacturers should revise their customs than that new Courts should be established to adjudicate on them. It would be thought outrageously absurd if any one were to propose that ambulances and surgeons should be provided at the end of every street to treat people who might happen to sprain their wrists by walking on their hands instead of their heels. If wool-staplers prefer to do business by word of mouth, they are at liberty to do so; but it is preposterous to make that a reason for taxing the community to provide a special staff of Judges to settle disputes which common prudence would have averted. In point of fact, we doubt whether such disputes occur very often at Bradford; but if they do not, then the Chamber of Commerce argument falls to the ground. We have no doubt, however, that the Chambers might do good service if they would examine the different customs of trade, and endeavour to assimilate them on rational and uniform principles. It is complained that the Law Courts at present are often unable to decide commercial cases satisfactorily, on account of their ignorance of the rules of trade; but if these rules were simple and well-defined, it would be easy to prove them in Court. It is because they are frequently loose, conflicting, or not universally accepted, that disputes in regard to them are difficult of settlement.

The proposal of Mr. Ayrton's Committee is that, without interfering with the ordinary jurisdiction of the County Courts for sums under 20*l.*, Tribunals of Commerce should be established in such of the large towns throughout the country as might be selected as convenient central points. The jurisdiction of these Courts is to be compulsory and exclusive over all cases which may be classified as commercial, and their procedure is to be of the simplest and most summary character. Each Court will be composed of a professional lawyer as President, with a Registrar and a couple of Assessors selected from the commercial community. The President and Registrar are to be appointed by the Crown, while the two Assessors are to be chosen in order of rotation from a number of commercial men who will be nominated for the purpose by the Lord Chancellor. The President and Registrar will be paid for their services, but it is assumed that mercantile men of high position and extensive business will be only too glad to sit day after day, advising on small debt cases, for the

honour of the office. We cannot say how far this expectation is likely to be realized, but there is certainly some ground for apprehension that the duties of the Assessors would be left chiefly to the men who had most time on their hands, or who preferred settling other people's business to minding their own. The favourite argument of the advocates of these new Courts is that commercial cases could be easily and cheaply settled if they were left to commercial men, and if the lawyers could be kept away from them. A working-man has recently found it necessary to explain that the working classes are by no means so homogeneous as the phrase would seem to imply; and in the same way it is necessary to remind the Chambers of Commerce and Mr. Ayrton's Committee that the "commercial classes" is an equally wide and comprehensive expression. It includes merchants and manufacturers, buyers and sellers, wholesale and retail dealers; and it is quite conceivable that a purveyor of raw material might not be altogether satisfied with the verdict of a jury of manufacturers, while the latter would be equally alarmed by the prospect of having a dispute with a purchaser adjudicated by commission-agents or merchants. There can be no doubt, however, that it would frequently be a great advantage to a Judge to be able to summon to his side honourable and trustworthy experts with whom he could consult on knotty technical points; but there is no reason, as far as we can see, why, if authority to call in such advisers is to be granted, it should be confined exclusively to one set of Courts, and, above all, why new Courts should have to be established for the purpose. The idea of a cheap Court of summary jurisdiction, sitting frequently, if not constantly, into which an aggrieved person could step out of the street any time he was passing, and have the person who had offended him brought to answer for himself, and where the two could argue the matter out face to face, after which the Court would at once give judgment, is, it must be admitted, a very pretty idea; and if it could be carried out, it would no doubt be of great advantage both to suitors and to the community. Even if absolute justice is not invariably done, it is at least a good thing to get disputes settled one way or the other. We are only afraid that this pretty project is somewhat too ideal. If Mr. Ayrton and his friends had taken the trouble to inquire how it happens that suits in the existing Courts are tedious and costly, they would perhaps have found reason to doubt whether the same causes would not, in the course of time, influence the procedure of the Tribunals of Commerce. It is not the fees or the rules of the Courts which occasion expense and delay, but the employment of lawyers, who prefer to do things in their own way, and who have their own reasons for this preference. If law business could be transacted without lawyers, great economy in litigation would no doubt be the result. It is assumed that, as a rule, the parties before the Tribunal of Commerce will conduct their own cases; but some of them may be unable or unwilling to do so, and, as barristers and attorneys are to be admitted, it is certain that they will be employed; a merchant or a manufacturer who might not hesitate to plead against a man of his own class would naturally be shy of encountering a trained lawyer. The cry against the lawyers is very like the equally foolish cry which is frequently raised against the middle-men; they are expensive, but indispensable, agents. There is perhaps a great deal to be said in favour of establishing cheap and simple Courts of First Instance throughout the country; but if they are to be established, why should they be confined to commercial cases? In point of act, if commercial cases were withdrawn from the other Courts, there would be very little left for them to do; for almost every case is, in one sense or another, of a commercial character. It is a very safe rule always to distrust schemes which are put forward with a grand name borrowed from the French. There is reason to suspect a project the promoters of which have not got the length of realizing to themselves in their plain mother-tongue what it is they want. Tribunals of Commerce, Councils of Conciliation, and Metric Systems are pretty much on a level. The evidence which has been taken by the Select Committee of last Session shows that the present arrangements for trying commercial cases are by no means satisfactory; but it has yet to be shown that new Courts must necessarily be established.

#### RAILWAYS AND THE PUBLIC.

AT last the Railway Companies seem to have laid to heart the lessons of the past, and are exerting themselves in earnest to apply them. Having been taught that unscrupulous competition is ruinous, they have gone as far as the logical inference that a general mutual understanding must be advantageous. Against the policy of amalgamation, viewed abstractedly, we have not a word to say. It is plain that the Companies and their customers might both be gainers by the economies which amalgamation would in many cases facilitate, and that travellers as well as shareholders ought to find their profit in the change. But will they? It is not solely a question of low fares; it is a question of accommodation as well. It is a question, as frequent accidents demonstrate to our cost, of the character and quantity of the labour employed by the Companies. How will the Railway Boards deal with their servants and their clients, should legislation make them autocrats in place of masters, by removing the wholesome check of competition. Once amalgamated, the only



practical consideration left to weigh with them will be the vague apprehension of being mulcted in damages for maiming and manslaughter. But remedy by civil process is slow and doubtful at best, and it is the tendency of average business men to snatch immediate profits at the chance of contingent risks, especially when sore driven by a herd of needy shareholders. So, repeating the question whether travellers and servants are likely to gain by amalgamation, we are compelled to answer it in the negative. Great things in the way of dividends will be expected from amalgamated Boards, and the eminent financiers presiding over them will have to justify the reputations that have raised them to their high places. They will be strongly tempted to subordinate the well-being of their servants and the safety of their customers to the rigid theories of political economy adopted by Mr. Price. The natural way of doing so will be by remorselessly keeping down working expenses. The percentage which working expenses bear to gross incomes is the crucial test by which the average shareholder tries the capacity of his administrators. Now labour figures as a formidable item in these expenses, and the price and the amount of the labour employed may be regulated very much more by the discretion of the Directors than by the price and quantity of coal, for example. They may seek labour cheap, without regard to its quality, and they can avoid multiplying hands by over-working those they have. We know too well how they manage matters at present. We do not go merely by the assertion of disinterested advocates like Mr. Bass, half admitted as they are by railway magnates like Mr. Price; nor even by the reports of meetings of railway servants assembled to discuss their grievances and concert measures for relief. We are content to judge the existing system by the evidence laid before our Law Courts and Government officials, and on that evidence it stands condemned. We might undertake to draw up a voluminous and damning indictment, collecting the materials from a six months' file of the morning journals. Scarcely a day goes by without being marked by one or more unconsidered paragraphs in some obscure corner. No wonder that small attention should be paid to the series of isolated accidents happening to the Companies' servants. Labour is plentiful in this over-crowded country, and the places of the victims are easily supplied. No wonder that the men, raw and dull enough at the beginning, go stupidly about their work, and continually expose themselves to unnecessary danger. Keeping him in harness all day, and allowing him sleep each night, is not the way to brighten up a cloddish labourer. We know that there was a school of slaveholders who conducted their plantations on the principle that it came cheaper to work up their slaves than to care for them; and this seems to be, to a great extent, the theory of the Companies, who can save their uneasy consciences with the idea that the English servitude is voluntary. We hear of miserable pointsmen on duty for twenty hours at a stretch; of men told off to the responsible post of signalman, who discharge its duties for fifteen hours at a time on two-and-twenty shillings a week. Yet we may conceive the feelings of an educated man of robust frame but somewhat sensitive temperament, stationed for the first time in the signal-box at Norwood or Clapham Junctions; trains working monotonously past him at intervals of two or three minutes, on an interlacing network of lines, and from time to time an express shooting by, charged with its cargo of living souls, whose lives depend on his unremitting attention. It would be physically impossible to sustain for any time the strain on the system. The average signalman, fortunately for him and for us, is doubtless more callous by temperament and habit than the amateur we have imagined as being in his place. Still, the mere idea that a moment's inattention may place him any day on his trial for manslaughter is sufficient to make it wearing work even for him. Towards the end of his cruelly prolonged watch nature must succumb perforce, or he must assist her with stimulants. He must be endowed with a rare constitution, bodily and moral, if he escapes becoming either reckless or a drunkard, or both. In a less degree the same remarks apply to guards entrusted with the lives of passengers. It is matter of notoriety that guards are more habitually overworked than any other class of railway servants. The recognised conception of their occupation seems to be that the business of travelling is so light and agreeable that it may be protracted indefinitely. It is protracted accordingly, day after day, from early morning far into the night. Accordingly the man falls asleep in his van when he should be applying the breaks, the train flies with accelerated velocity when it should be coming to a standstill, and then come the crash, the smashed limbs, the shattered frames, and the mangled corpses. The guard perhaps gets so many years with hard labour; the Directors merely bear their share of the damages in which the Company is amerced. The unhappy railway servants, being less versed than their masters in those economical laws of which they are the victims, remonstrate at intervals. At intervals they find the public in one of its periodical fits of panic or virtue, and persuade it to indorse the appeal. The Railway Boards either give an evasive answer or more probably take refuge in contemptuous silence. At present, however, we have a certain security and consolation, such as it is. Should the Scotch express from Euston Square come to grief, the next time we go to Edinburgh we may travel by the Great Northern. Fancy flatters us that on the rival line the staff may be stronger and more liberally remunerated. But when all the lines are worked from a single centre and on an identical system, that doubtful comfort will be lost to us. And when all the giant

limbs are welded on to one compact iron Colossus, protests will be more idle and appeals more fruitless even than now.

It may seem an idle dream to contemplate the possibility of enlightened and generous railway management. Rational men seem inspired to utter irrational nonsense when in the capacity of Chairmen they address their constituents officially; prudent men play fast and loose with their money when they invest in railway shares; shrewd men become short-sighted, and liberal men parsimonious. We remember how Sir Edward Watkin, who passes with justice for an excellent man of business, argued gravely in favour of the Companies' divine right to a minimum dividend of 5 per cent. And, developing the new doctrine, the Companies hold that, because they have chosen to exhaust their strong-boxes in reckless internecine warfare, they have earned a right to replenish them at the expense of their unlucky servants and the innocent public. It is accepting a false issue altogether to urge a Board to raise its wages because it finds itself in a position to pay a better dividend. The public has a right to demand that the Companies shall take reasonable care of life before they look after returns in money. Yet more liberal management would assuredly pay in the end, even regarding it strictly from the commercial point of view. With amalgamation the Companies could afford to be just and generous if they went the right way to work. But then the management should be enlightened as well; and it is astonishing how much room for reform there is in that direction, and how obtuse the Companies often are to their own interests. We should like to see them come to an understanding, not with regard to screwing down staffs and wages, or coercing the public into travelling under perilous conditions, but with respect to curing us of unreasonable habits which do little good to us, and a great deal of harm to them. They treat us as the unprincipled nurses who stuff spoiled children with unwholesome food to stop their crying. They consult our unjust caprices while they retrench in everything that would assure our safety. Half-a-crown to a guard or an inspector will generally procure a man a compartment to himself where he may be crushed in solitary dignity. Although we own to sharing this weakness with most of our countrymen, the practice is utterly indefensible. You pay for a single seat, and a single seat is all that you have a right to. If you are sufficiently rich and luxurious to care for a *compé* all to yourself, take it by all means. But why, because a Company is a Company, should a high-principled and pious man bribe its servants to make away with their employers' property? Like all underhand practices, the system is prolific of evil. The Companies suffer. Nothing is more costly than the unnecessary multiplication of rolling-stock, which must be kept up and looked to. Nothing is more wearing to engines and permanent way than dragging trains that are needlessly heavy. More coal is consumed, and more guards are employed. The servants suffer, for they get hopelessly demoralized when encouraged to sacrifice their employers' interest to their own. The travellers suffer. They make themselves accomplices in the sins of the servants; and yet the fault is scarcely theirs. Pressure is put on them to bribe in self-defence, and if they cannot afford to bribe they go to the wall. The management licenses a tax on poverty, which is of the less consequence, to be sure, when we think of the style of carriage in which it compels poverty to travel. We have heard it reported that there is a standing by-law against railway servants accepting "tips." If there be any truth in the rumour, we are sure the by-law has passed into a standing joke. We suspect no one except the lucky recipients has a conception how far the abuse is carried in certain instances. If the guards on such trains as the Scotch and Irish expresses candidly reported their receipts to the Income-tax Commissioners, we are sure the returns would be startling reading. Half-a-crown as a retaining-fee for a thorough journey; a shilling for being asked, with significant politeness, at what intermediate station you purpose to descend; what you please for the pair of sleeping boards that are to make you comfortable for the night; and special refreshers when you have urgent need of a friend at court—as, for example, when some indiscreet gentleman at York tries to intrude himself into a carriage where he sees only a couple of places occupied. The money passes openly under the eyes of the officials whose duty it is to look to the observance of the by-laws and to protect the interests of the Company. We are sure there are cases enough of gross hardship in the railway service, and many crying abuses. But we reserve our pity as a rule for the pointsmen, signal-men, goods' guards, and engine-drivers, who are not brought in direct contact with the public. Passenger guards, and the porters on the great platforms, may, for aught we know, have reason to complain of their hours; but we are very sure they cannot grumble at their wages. We often wonder how it happens that these lucrative places are not put up to auction under the present parsimonious system. The Boards have never recognised a vested interest in these "stealings." The fortunate holders of the places know too well what they are worth to be willing lightly to part with them, and probably by this time they are stock and bond-holders to a large amount. Unquestionably the bidding would be brisk; and if you consented to guarantee fixity of tenure, the guardships would go off like ad- vovsons. On the whole, however, we think the Companies would do better to reconsider the system of attaching spare carriages to every train for their paid servants to trade in. They would find that the retrenchment to be effected would tell enormously in their balance-sheets; they could afford, by paying extra premium in the shape of wages, to ensure against those actions of damages which

give indignant jurymen opportunities of avenging their slaughtered countrymen; and we may add a subsidiary consideration by way of rider—they would economize human life and happiness, and stop a fruitful source of immorality.

#### THE "CAT" INTERVIEWED.

THE Special Correspondent's vocation almost departed with the surrender of Paris, and he is obliged to make what he can of any opportunities for the exercise of his art which offer themselves in the course of domestic history. We ought not therefore to be surprised to hear that "several gentlemen connected with literature" attended to witness the flogging of two garotters in the gaol of Newgate. These gentlemen were invited by the Sheriff, who is described by one of them as having a cheery voice, and "the cut of the fighting captain of a man-of-war." The Sheriff with the cheery voice made to his guests a little speech, in which he expressed the opinion that "operations such as those we have to get through this morning" should be private, but not secret. The guests were stimulated by this speech to employ their utmost powers of observation and description in the cause of justice and morality. If punishment is meant to be a terror to evil-doers, the most vivid pictures that can be drawn by words of its infliction may be expected from those newspapers which devote themselves most zealously to the instruction of society. The subject cannot now be dismissed with a careless reference to the hour

When morning prayer and flagellation end.

But Our Own Reporter, having comfortably breakfasted and driven to the prison in a Hansom cab, must paint for us the whole scene, from the "sinister and sceptical" countenance of the flogger to the livid back of the floggee. The flogger was the hangman Calcraft, who receives, as we venture to hope, a consideration in his wages for periodically undergoing inspection by reporters. It is consonant with our ideas that the hangman should look "sinister," but we decline to admit into our mind the supposition that he can be "sceptical." We shall assume, until the contrary is proved, that the hangman is, as he ought to be, a believer in the efficiency of all existing institutions, including himself. Indeed we are told at a later stage of the proceedings that Calcraft is intolerant of criticism on his performances, and we gather from the description of one of these that he is really a considerable artist in his line, or rather in his nine lines. He appears to economize the power of suffering which, by a happy provision of nature, is not inexhaustible. The patient under Calcraft's skilful treatment "retains consciousness, and is sensible of pain to the last." The reporter thinks that in criminals guilty of violence this is an advantage, because they are often of so debased a mental standard as to be incapable of being racked by anticipation, and so lost to self-respect as to suffer nothing from the circumstance of who it is that holds the whip. We cannot but admire this ingenious attempt to construct a philosophy of the cat. We fail, however, to see the special application of this reasoning to garroters. If crime is to be punished by pain, it is desirable that pain should be felt, and we should greatly doubt whether any criminal is so stolid, or to put it finely, has "so debased a mental standard," as not to be made uncomfortable over-night by the prospect of being flogged next morning. We should suppose that when a man takes to garrotting, he has not much self-respect to trouble him, and we cannot help thinking that, if one must be flogged, it would be better to undergo the operation by a regular practitioner.

We will not, however, further discuss theories, because we regret to find ourselves in doubt as to the accuracy of the observations on which these theories must necessarily be founded. Among the "gentlemen connected with literature" who responded to the Sheriff's invitation, one was the Reporter of the *Standard* and another was the Correspondent of the *Telegraph*. We discover, to our extreme disappointment, that these two eminent authorities differ in their estimate of Mr. Calcraft's work as entirely as if they were discussing a speech of Mr. Gladstone. The Reporter has kindly drawn for us a picture of a garotter's back, on which he saw successively "bluish ridges," "streaks painted with iodine," and streaks merged in one another and grown "purply." He thinks that with more complete laceration the pain would not have been greater, and perhaps might have been less. But the Correspondent treats both Calcraft and his instrument with disrespect. He mentions that he had never seen a flogging before, and hopes never to see another, and we cannot help remarking how kind it was of him to go and see this flogging, and describe it in the columns of the journal which has the largest circulation in the world. But at the same time he would look back upon that morning's spectacle with greater satisfaction if he could feel some pity for the flogged, and less contempt for the flogger and his weapon. To put it plainly, his sense of justice or propriety demanded an effusion of gore, and there was none. He seems to apprehend that he will be the means of revealing to the criminal class that their terror of the lash is exaggerated. The next step in enterprising journalism will probably be to interview a garotter a few days after flogging, inspect his back, and obtain from him a description of his sensations. We hope that opportunity may not thus be given for speaking of Calcraft's flagellations in the irreverent terms which Topsy applied to the whippings of Miss Phelia. But the Correspondent evidently undervalues Calcraft, for the same reason that made a portion of the public depreciate the service of

Lord Napier at Magdala. He demands that the Newgate cat should be made "at least twice as formidable as it is at present." His colleague of the *Standard* had observed with apparent surprise that the cat was not loaded with lead, and had informed us that its cords were thicker than in the navy and thinner than at Pentonville. We rather believe that Mr. Bruce reckons among his many duties that of adopting and certifying the pattern of the garotter's cat. There are evidently many varieties of this animal, and probably many gradations of its ferocity, depending partly upon its size and make, and partly upon the strength and skill with which its movements are directed. The Correspondent, however, views the whole performance as a take-in. Undoubtedly, says he, the cat inflicts considerable pain; but he had understood that the application of the knotted thongs to the human back was productive of "a spell of intolerable agony," and he plainly intimates that he, and the British public in his person, have been disappointed. He does not appear to hold his colleague's theory of the "debased mental standard" of garotters, for he states that one of the patients dreaded the operation so much that he shammed illness. "There can be no doubt that his horrified mind pictured an instrument many times more severe" than that which he beheld in the hand of Calcraft. It is an injustice to those who rely upon the law for protection that the tormenting forebodings of the culprit were not amply justified by the result. Calcraft may believe in himself, but that belief will not henceforth be propagated through the medium of the largest circulation in the world. He is not only old and weak, but he is soft-hearted, and his much-dreaded lash is a mere whip of string "which does not hurt more than a birch-rod." We shall not be so unjust as to blame Mr. Bruce because Calcraft has grown older while he has been at the Home Office, but it certainly is disappointing to find even the *Telegraph* imputing feebleness to the Government in the important function of dispensing punishment. We do not know about the sword, but it appears that our rulers, according to the testimony of one of their most zealous supporters, bear the rod very much in vain. The *Standard* had bidden us admire Calcraft's skill, which nicely apportioned pain to the capacity for suffering; but the *Telegraph* tells us that the whole performance was a delusion. It is a pleasant prospect at the beginning of winter that the notion will be propagated among garotters that flogging is not a formidable punishment.

If this sort of descriptive writing gains encouragement, we shall expect that the illustrated newspapers will next take the subject up; and we shall see a likeness of Calcraft, "sinister and sceptical," a plan of the machine in which the culprit is placed, and a view of the proceedings, giving proper prominence to the Sheriff and the "gentlemen connected with literature." We must say, however, that there can hardly be a lower or more depraved taste than that to which such writing and illustration panders, and we trust that the more respectable portion of the press will make a resolute stand against indulging it. The *Telegraph*, of course, is insensible to the impropriety of sending a Correspondent on such an errand; and the *Standard* unfortunately must follow where its great rival leads. We may hope, however, that the authorities of Newgate, or those to whom they are responsible, will not invite guests who will make an opportunity for fine writing out of what they see. The fussy self-importance of a tradesman who has become Sheriff is perhaps gratified to see his words reported, and his movements described, in the columns of a newspaper of world-wide circulation. The plea of the Sheriff for inviting reporters and encouraging them to report is sadly falsified by the Correspondent of the *Telegraph*, who has served the minister of the law much as Balaam served King Balak. He was expected to give a "timely warning" to garotters, but he gives rather a useful hint to possible victims of garotting not to rely for protection on a punishment which has lost its terrors. We must say that this is rather hard upon the Sheriff, who had announced in a speech introductory to the proceedings that "the great object of punishment is repression." We hope, however, that this Sheriff and his successors will take warning by what has occurred, and will not again be tempted to allow the virtue of the cat to be brought in question. There must be some strange and subtle charm in writing and reading descriptions of flagellation, and we believe that if a garotter, with the assistance of a fine writer from the staff of the *Telegraph*, were to compose an account of his mental and bodily sensations before and during his punishment, the sale of such a book would be enormous. Indeed, there is growing up what may be called a literature of the rod. We noticed some time ago a wonderful series of letters on this subject, in a publication purporting to be written by and for ladies, which we thought, until we were instructed to the contrary, were indecent. We were told that this discussion, which has gone on almost to the present time, was conducted among women, and that men had nothing to do with it. We will only remark upon it that, although the cat wielded by Calcraft is made by the Correspondent of the *Telegraph* a sham, the birch in the hands of a "pious mother" appears to be a stern reality. We cannot of course prevent real or pretended ladies writing and publishing their experiences, active or passive, of this kind, but we must protest against an act of public justice being made the occasion of pandering to a degraded taste.



## REVIEWS.

## REUCHLIN.\*

THERE are several aspects under which a competent biography of Reuchlin invites attention; and Dr. Ludwig Geiger, who brings special as well as general qualifications to his laborious task, cannot be accused of having mistaken the importance of any one of the main points of interest presented by its subject. The scholar to whom the study of Greek in Germany owes its revival, and the study of Hebrew its beginning, meets with judicious appreciation at the hands of his most recent biographer, who is at pains to indicate with considerable precision the intermediate, and, in a sense, connecting position occupied by Reuchlin between the older and younger schools of German humanists, between the fellow-labourers of Thomas à Kempis and the literary comrades of Ulrich von Hutten. But even the literary student will not disdain to allow that the name of Reuchlin is above all illustrious on account of the moral significance of his conduct at the crisis which late in life his career underwent. He is in no sense in which the term has any definite meaning to be regarded as one of the precursors of the Reformation—a title which, notwithstanding his occasional timidity, and his satisfaction with his personal stand point, cannot be denied to Erasmus. But, though in his old age Reuchlin lived in the house of Eck, and looked coldly upon the first reformatory efforts of Melancthon, he is chiefly remembered as a martyr to a cause dearer to the consciousness of our own times, dearer above all to the consciousness of his own nation in the age of its fuller intellectual and moral development, than any movement of religious reform. That cause may be called by different names; but whether we choose to characterize it as the cause of Science or as that of Toleration, it was upheld by Reuchlin in an age upon which its value had only begun to dawn, it triumphed in his partial actual success, and in his absolute moral victory. Thus it is that the greatest men of Reuchlin's nation as it were join hands with him across the lapse of centuries. If in his own day it was the *clari viri*, the *illustres viri*, the leaders of intellectual progress, to whose applause and sympathy he could proudly appeal, while satire branded his adversaries with immortal ridicule, the great men of after ages could claim brotherhood with the modest champion who had stirred the nest of the ancestors of their own dunces and bigots, and who had bequeathed to posterity the example at once of an arduous struggle and of a moral victory. Lessing had not forgotten the Dominicans of Cologne when he waged war upon his "Subconductor" and "Chief Pastor" of Hamburg; and Goethe, as Dr. Geiger reminds us, loved to compare his own life-long struggle against the friends of darkness with the unforgotten efforts of Reuchlin.

It is not to be wondered that those who in our own times recognise in the movement of the fifteenth century something more than the birth-time of a great religious schism, and who remember that it was not until the period which we call that of the Reformation proper that this movement was narrowed into a theological conflict, should recur with ever fresh interest to the lives of the great men who lived before Luther. Reuchlin, as Dr. Geiger well shows, belongs emphatically to a period of transition; he stands in the middle between the calm and self-concentrated efforts of the earlier labourers in the cause of intellectual and moral progress, tinged rather than transformed by the first rays of the humanistic revival, and the many-sided and audacious onset of the contemporaries of his own later years. When his life closed, the better part of the glorious inheritance of which Italy would have fain claimed a monopoly had been secured to Germanic Europe; but though he lived to see the Reformation, he witnessed its beginnings without sympathy, and would beyond a doubt have plainly disapproved of its ulterior course. Thus he, whom Strauss, who of all men ought best to know what the phrase implies, calls the first man of learning of the modern style (*der erste Gelehrte neuen Stils*), was unwilling to break wholly with the past. In what sense is he deserving of so proud a title, and why may he be claimed as a venerated fellow-labourer by men who recognise no finality even in the movement which to him was distasteful as an unnecessary rupture?

No man creates his age; and when Reuchlin commenced his career as a scholar, his native Germany, and in particular those regions of it in which his life was spent, had already made a considerable advance in the pursuit of learning for its own sake. Yet, unlike many of the humanists rather younger than himself with whom he came into friendly contact, he was still obliged to pursue his studies in *παρρηγορ* rather than as the main occupation of his life. By profession he was a lawyer, and he had also served his prince, the famous Duke Eberhard of Würtemberg, in several of those diplomatic missions on which sovereigns of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were wont to employ their servants learned in the law. After the death of Eberhard, one of the most patriotic and open-minded princes of his age (it was he who had caused the first two Philippics of Demosthenes, translated by Reuchlin, to be distributed as a stimulus against France), and the removal of his successor and namesake, stormy times had begun in Suabia; for Duke Ulrich had in 1503, the seventeenth year of his life, assumed the reins of Government. Of his turbulent career we have spoken in this journal on a previous occasion; its central crime lives for

ever in the burning invectives of Ulrich von Hutten. Reuchlin, a few years after this, in 1511, resigned his post as judge-commissioner of the Suabian League, and after thirty-one years of public service—he was now fifty-five years of age—sought the retirement of a studious life. But it was precisely at this time that he was destined to be involved in the great quarrel which is inseparably associated with his name.

This quarrel was due to Reuchlin's proceedings as a legal functionary; but it derived its importance from his position as a scholar. That position had not been gained at once. Nothing is more characteristic of Reuchlin than the laborious fulness with which he pursued every study to which he devoted himself. As a lawyer he expressed his amusement at the young students "who in their first year think they can decide any dispute, in their second begin to doubt, and only begin to learn in their third, when they find that they know nothing." He encouraged the study of history, even if he was not, as Melancthon believed, himself the author of a *History of the World*. But it was of course philological study in which he most enthusiastically engaged. He had not indeed, as Dr. Geiger shows, that contempt for his own German tongue which was characteristic of his age, and which is amusingly illustrated by an edict of the Austrian Government to the students of the Vienna University in the year 1499—"ne in vulgaribus, ubi penitus nulla originalis scientia continetur, imbuerentur." He produced several translations into his native language, and the book which, as we shall see, brought down upon him the wrath of his enemies was written in German. But as a scholar he used the language of scholars, Latin; and at a very early period of his life he had published his *Vocabularius Breviloquus*, a Latin dictionary, which went through not less than twenty-five editions. Yet the Latinity of Reuchlin was not that of an Erasmus, although he was the first German of his age to venture upon an imitation of Terentian comedy. But the writing of Ciceronian Latin was not an art of sudden growth, and could perhaps be least expected to be rapidly brought to perfection by a lawyer. Curiously enough, Reuchlin's great quarrel with the *Obscure Ones* was destined indirectly to contribute to the overthrow of scholastic Latin hardly less than to the overthrow of scholastic theology. The immortal satire which it provoked against his opponents taught the learners of Latin composition what it behoved them to avoid better than a hundred grammars and phrase-books. German ecclesiastics, and we venture to add German philologists, have written some doubtful Latin since; but the darkest age of Latin prose composition has passed away with Frater Conradus Dollenkopius and Herbordus Misladerius. As to their bugbear, the great "Cannon" personally, Erasmus opined that he was indeed "vir magnus, sed oratio redolebat suum seculum adhuc horridius impolitiusque."

To the advance of the study of Greek Reuchlin's services were inferior only to those of Erasmus himself, and they began, of course, at a considerably earlier date. He published translations from the Greek both in his native tongue and in Latin; of the latter only some have come down to us. But he was not content with making the matter of Greek authors accessible to the world at large; he insisted upon the necessity of a faithful study of the original texts; wines, he said, which are poured from one cask into another lose their fine taste. His own Greek reading is shown by Dr. Geiger to have been astonishingly extensive; he was also the author of a Greek grammar, which unfortunately was never published. One of the very few things which are "generally known" concerning Reuchlin—namely, that he was the originator of a method of Greek pronunciation—is not to be regarded as a fact at all. He pronounced Greek like his teachers, the Greeks themselves. Erasmus introduced a new method of pronunciation which had been communicated to him by accident as the method actually in vogue among certain Greeks; but in his *Dialogus* on the subject he makes no reference to Reuchlin. What is quite certain is that neither Reuchlin nor Erasmus was, or professed to be, an inventor; and that both made appeal to what they, not foreseeing the protests of modern comparative philologists, not unnaturally regarded as the only kind of authority on the subject.

But we must pass to Reuchlin's third, or rather, according to his own proud statement, his "fifth tongue." As he had learnt French and Italian, and as he had learnt Greek, from living lips, so he derived his knowledge of that language which owes to him its establishment as a subject of scientific study among modern nations from his acquaintance with members of the despised nation, who treasured it as their most precious inheritance. The ordinance of the Council of Vienna, which commanded the foundation of Hebrew Chairs at the principal Universities of the Continent, had remained all but a dead letter; and no German University was included in the number. At Paris Reuchlin had learnt no Hebrew; in Italy he at first found it extremely difficult to obtain an Old Testament in the original tongue. Alone he ventured into the *terra incognita* of this new study. The difficulties surrounding it are incomprehensible to our age. The few Jews in Würtemberg held themselves prohibited by an ordinance of the Talmud from imparting to a Christian the knowledge of their tongue. It was only by a happy accident that, on a mission to the Emperor Frederick III., in the year 1492, Reuchlin found a learned Jew, Jacob ben Jehiel Loans, in the position of body-physician to the Emperor. This learned man became Reuchlin's teacher in Hebrew, and was long afterwards gratefully recognised by him as such. For the Christian world he remained himself, for nearly a generation, the solitary teacher of this language. It was only quite towards the close of his life that the study of Hebrew began to be

\* *Johann Reuchlin: sein Leben und seine Werke.* Von Dr. Ludwig Geiger. Leipzig: 1871.

pursued at the Universities. Up to that time, in Dr. Geiger's words, "all who desired thoroughly to learn the language were obliged, almost exclusively, to have resort to Reuchlin." And all who had resort to him (his grand-nephew Melancthon was among the number) found him ever willing to communicate his treasures, and to communicate them, like Socrates of old, gratuitously.

It was in his relation to the study of Hebrew (which, as a matter of course, he regarded as the mother-tongue of all other languages) that Reuchlin necessarily came into contact with the theology of his age. Our theologians, he complained, neglect the words of Holy Scripture in order to attend to the dialectic sophisms of Aristotle. On the other hand, though far from being elevated above all prejudice against the hereditary adversaries of Christianity, he respected in the Jews a people which, through the course of the centuries, had preserved the sacred text pure and intact. It was, he thought, the duty of Christians to treat the Jews with gentleness and kindness; to allow them the full benefit of the law; to convert them by argument, and to acquire the means for the purpose by causing their language to be publicly taught, and their books to be translated; "denique summa summarum in jure scriptum est quod Judei tanquam proximi nostri a nobis diligendi sunt." Thus it was that Reuchlin, instead of contenting himself with the study of the Old Testament and free criticisms of the errors of the Vulgate version, passed boldly to inquiry into, and comment upon, other Jewish literature. In this inquiry he became acquainted with the mysterious teachings of the Cabbalah, and, like Pico of Mirandola before him, sought to discover in the secret teachings of the Rabbins the means of converting the Jews out of the mouths of their own doctors. In his attempt to develop the foundations of Christian belief out of a combination of Jewish with Greek philosophy, he satisfied himself, if but few of his contemporaries; and it is probable that he lacked the clearness of thought which alone could have given any fruitful effect to his labours. To us moderns it is simply impossible to pursue speculations on the mysterious significance of the letters of the Old Testament, and of their correspondence to the Pythagorean numbers. But these speculations are not to be regarded as the essence of Reuchlin's system; they rather only constitute an attempt to bring to book, if we may use the expression, the mystic conception of the union of God and man, which had pervaded the minds of a Rusbroeck or a Thomas à Kempis. The attempt remained sterile; it was equally repugnant to Luther's desire for the tangible and to Melancthon's dislike of the fanciful; while Erasmus contented himself with observing that "nunquam mihi neque Talmud, neque Cabbala arrisit." On the other hand, Reuchlin's book *On the Miraculous Word* provoked a bristling rejoinder from Jacob Hochstraten, the Dominican Superior of Heretics (Ketzermeister) of Cologne.

But it was in no immediate connexion with his Cabbalistic studies that Reuchlin became involved in the great dispute concerning the books of the Jews which forms the most generally interesting chapter of his biography. Dr. Geiger has given a circumstantial account of this episode, and refers for part of it, with praiseworthy modesty, to a vigorous chapter in Strauss's *Life of Hutten*, which a popular edition has just brought within reach of a wider public. In either work the reader will find a clear account of one of the most determined struggles which bigotry has ever waged against reason and justice, though happily the contest ended in this instance in a war of words.

It is known how, at the close of the fifteenth century, the Dominicans of the Inquisition succeeded in bringing about the expulsion of the Jews from Spain and Portugal, and it has often been assumed that a similar scheme, on the part of the German Dominicans, lay at the root of the proceedings which were nominally the work of certain converted German Jews. But there seems to be no proof of any such deep-laid plan; and, indeed, Reuchlin's biographer, with a turn of phrase betraying something more than the indignation of an historical student, observes that "baptized Jews have never needed a party to put them forward and make use of them, in order to calumniate those whom they had formerly loved." For the prime mover in the agitation against the books of the Jews was, as is well known, a baptized Jew of the name of Pfefferkorn. Whatever may have been the motives of this worthy, there can be no doubt that the ground of his attack upon his former co-religionists lay in the publicity which the art of printing was beginning to give to the Rabbinical works. In his *Judenpiegel*, published in 1507, he demanded that the Jews should be deprived of their books, which were the chief cause of their perversity. To demand the expulsion of the Jews themselves was only an afterthought of desperation.

The demand of Pfefferkorn agreed but too well with the principles of the Dominicans, who claimed the censorship over all books by virtue of a Papal authority, for them to hesitate about giving it their support. But no step could be taken against the Jews without an appeal to the Emperor, at whose disposal their property lay. For, just as in England, up to the expulsion of the Jews under Edward I., they were technically the property of the Crown, so in the Empire they were the servants of the Imperial Chamber or Exchequer, and their possessions were absolutely under the control of the Emperor Maximilian I., who received the active Pfefferkorn in his camp before Padua, granted him powers to demand from the Jews throughout the Empire such books as were directed against the Christian faith, and, with the consent of the parish priest and two secular magistrates, to suppress them. In order, as Dr. Geiger suggests, to surround his

undertaking with a halo of learning, Pfefferkorn, on his return from Italy, called upon Reuchlin at Stuttgart to request his co-operation; but Reuchlin very speedily sent him about his business. He was not, however, to escape becoming involved in this distasteful effort of a meddlesome convert. Pfefferkorn had attempted to stretch his powers, and to force the Jews at Frankfurt to deliver up all their books. The stir created by this unwarranted demand had finally induced the Emperor to wash his hands of the affair; so far as lay in his power, by entrusting its further conduct to the Archbishop-Elector of Mayence, who was to consult a mixed Commission on the question of the nature of the books confiscated by Pfefferkorn. This Commission included, besides representatives of four Universities, the Cologne Supervisor of Heretics, a Jewish convert of note named Victor von Karben, and Reuchlin. Meanwhile, the Jews for the present received their property back; and the Universities and Reuchlin were each called upon to draw up an opinion on the nature of the Jewish books. It may be added that the Jews never seem to have been in the sequel called upon to surrender them again.

Reuchlin's opinion on the question thus referred to him was the origin of the persecution to which he was afterwards exposed; it is at the same time his chief title to honourable remembrance in the history of the progress of religious toleration. He divided the Jewish books into two unequal classes—namely, works manifestly containing injurious attacks upon Christianity, and those which were not open to such a charge. The former, of which he only names two—which he moreover states to be prohibited among the Jews themselves—he proposes, after they have been sufficiently examined and legally condemned, to devote to destruction, their possessors being subjected to punishment; for the rest, which include the Talmud, the Cabbalah, the Commentaries on the Bible, the sermons and hymns of the Jews, and their works on non-theological subjects, he claims full toleration. They contain no vituperation of Christianity; that they do not recognise the divinity of Christ is a matter of course; for "such is their belief, by which they mean to injure no man." The Christians, he urges, have no right to proceed against these books. The Jews are subject to God not less than the Christians; if they act wrongly, God will punish them. No Christian has a claim to decide concerning the creed of those who are not Christians. Moreover, even secular law prohibits such an intervention; for the Jews are members and citizens of the Germanic Empire. The contemplated distinction, he continues, cannot be expected to lead to the extirpation of the Jewish faith; this is only to be looked for from endeavours to convert the Jews by gentle means, and for this purpose it is necessary to learn the real nature of their teachings, for which a systematic study of their language is indispensable.

Such was Reuchlin's declaration of views, which indeed breathe the spirit of a more clear-sighted and a more generous age than his own. Of the other opinions, all but one (which temporized) were in a directly contrary sense; and now the storm broke loose upon his devoted head. Pfefferkorn launched his *Handspiegel* against Reuchlin, whom he accused of having been bribed by the Jews; and Reuchlin replied with his *Augenspiegel*, in which he indignantly denied the insolent imputation, and refuted thirty-three additional lies advanced against him. At the same time it is impossible to suppress a wish that Reuchlin had maintained as firm a tone in his pamphlets as he had assumed in his opinion. He adheres in the main to the standpoint of the latter; but there are some modifications and some explanations in a not very natural sense, which it would be pleasant for a biographer of Reuchlin less honest than Dr. Geiger to be able to forget. Yet the *Augenspiegel* became the cause of the persecution by which the Cologne Dominicans hereupon attempted to silence him. We have no space left to pursue the complicated course of the struggle. It was conducted on both sides with unflinching energy. Reuchlin's book was condemned by most of the German Universities, as well as by Louvain; and even at Paris it was ordered to be burnt, and he was called upon to recant. Then an attempt, frustrated by the interference of the Emperor, was made to condemn the book before the Inquisitorial Tribunal at Mayence; and, finally, after Reuchlin and his work had been acquitted at Speier, an appeal found its way to Rome, where, after endless efforts on either side, a mandate *de supersedingendo* quashed proceedings, without giving a triumph to either party. Pope Leo X. in this way satisfied at once his literary and his political conscience; and after Rome had spoken, or rather had declined to speak, the matter was at an end (1516).

But its significance was not destined to pass away. Not only had the attempt at persecuting the Jews failed, and the attempt at crushing the advocate of tolerance likewise broken down, but his enemies had made his cause the cause of what now for the first time appeared before Europe in the form of a united party. Round the venerable figure of Reuchlin all the friends of learning and enlightenment, all the humanists throughout Germany, had banded together in support of what they recognised as a cause common to them all. Mutianus and Erasmus, Melancthon and Cœcolampadius, and two-score other names shone in the list of those who had openly testified to him their sympathy and admiration. And who stood on the opposite side—on the side of the Dominican Hochstraten and the converted Jew Pfefferkorn? Hochstraten's subsequent successor, Arnold von Tüngern, and the first light of the orthodox University of Cologne, Magister Ortuinus Gratius, and—the correspondents of Ortuin. For the names of these Obscure Ones, the authors of their Letters, the wicked Crotus and the reckless Hutten, are



responsible; but collectively they are assured of a typical immortality. Reuchlin himself was not a man of heroic mould; but his learning and intelligence and his native uprightness had left him no choice but to speak as he thought, when challenged to give a solemn declaration of opinion. The eager and angry bigotry of his adversaries made him a martyr, and converted an attempt to snatch a victory for intolerance into the first great demonstration on behalf of moral and intellectual freedom which Europe had witnessed. He died not long afterwards, in 1522, in his sixty-eighth year. In his old age, after the struggle of his life was over, he had for the first time taught from his proper place, a University chair; students had flocked to his feet at Ingolstadt, which, according to a Jesuit critic, ran the risk of losing the true faith by reason of his Hebrew lectures. But no danger threatened the Church from the illustrious old man, who soon afterwards ended his days in his beloved Suabia, where at Tübingen he instructed his last pupils in the grammar of Greek and Hebrew. Reuchlin was not an aggressive reformer, and he can only be called a reformer at all if the name is to be applied to all who in their own sphere of action aid in the advance of enlightenment, and who, when summoned to avow or renounce their conviction of the truth, are not ashamed openly to declare it. There are grander and more splendid figures than his in the history of his native land, but there is none more truly representative of that noble product of ancient lore and Christian life—the German scholar.

#### ESSAYS BY A BIRMINGHAM MANUFACTURER.\*

MR. SARGANT, whose previous volumes of essays we have noticed on former occasions, has published a third volume, consisting of four essays. Upon three of these essays we shall say but few words. A few pages are devoted to the discussion of the proper definition of capital, and Mr. Sargent puts his point, whatever it may be worth, with sufficient clearness and compression. Another short essay treats of the proper course to be pursued in regard to the Princess's dowry. Mr. Sargent's own view of the matter is one in which, as he appears to be fully conscious, it is not very likely that he will find many sympathizers. According to him, monarchy is an effete institution which must go in a few years, but which should be suffered to decay as quietly as may be. Meanwhile, he thinks it fair that those who take an interest in a superfluous institution should pay for it; and he therefore proposes that a special fund should be raised by the wealthy classes to supply the dowries and allowances of the Royal Family. We rather regret that a man of Mr. Sargent's generally sound sense should have reasoned himself into so fantastic a theory, and should have published the result of his reasoning. We fear that the proposal indicates a certain deficiency in a proper sense of humour. A third and larger essay, entitled "Comparative Morality," is chiefly a discussion of the moral standard actually existing in the various civilized nations of the world, especially in regard to their consumption of intoxicating liquors. It contains many interesting facts, and the fruits of a good deal of reading. We may be gratified by the conclusion that we are not much worse than our neighbours, or saddened by the thought that our neighbours are no better than we. We will only remark, however, that the essay illustrates an excellent quality of Mr. Sargent—his resolution, namely, to look into statistics for himself, and not to be carried away by the vague declamations of popular philanthropists. Things are bad enough amongst us in all conscience; but it is curious to remark how many of the supposed facts handed down from one writer to another as demonstrating our deep and growing corruption rest on no sound substratum of statistical inquiry.

We turn, however, from these essays to one which occupies nearly half the volume, and is entitled the "New Academy." It is a long discussion of a great, and perhaps a growing, evil of our time—the excessive love of light literature and the corresponding impatience of severe study—ending with the proposal of a remedial measure. This measure is the foundation of an English Academy, or, as Mr. Sargent calls it in the text, an Order for the Encouragement of Philosophical and Literary Merit. In order to meet various objections which will at once occur to his readers, he provides that the elections to this Order should never be due to Court favour or political influence; that the merit of candidates for admission should be decided by their published works, though they should be invited to produce the printed opinions of critics; but, after the first election, they should further be required to write an essay in presence of examiners, by way, as we understand Mr. Sargent, of proving their capacity to write their own works; that the examiners should be appointed by some method as yet undetermined, which however does not involve any kind of co-optation; that there should be different ranks in the Order, so that a stimulus might be provided for those who had once been elected; and, finally, that though merit of all varieties should ultimately be admissible to the Order, it should be limited in the first instance to distinction in moral and political philosophy. The bare statement of these provisions will be sufficient to excite the contemptuous incredulity of a good many of our readers. The proposal, for example, that a grown-up man is to sit down and write an essay in order to show that he really wrote his own books confirms our view of Mr. Sargent's deficient

perception of the humorous. It is one of those plans which are sufficiently disposed of by a laugh; or, let us rather say, by a benevolent smile; though we fancy that we could raise objections enough to it in sober earnest if it were worth while. Moreover, as Mr. Sargent admits, it is much easier to say that Court favour and political interest are to have no influence than to show how they, or certain other powers at least equally objectionable, are to be prevented from having an influence. How, for example, is it possible to suppose that an Academy necessarily consisting of elderly and respectable men will not look with disfavour upon the rising talent which advocates novel, and therefore heretical, opinions? Would the originators of a new school of thought have in any case a fair chance? Mr. Sargent admits that such a man as Comte would scarcely be elected, and we may fairly doubt whether many persons of less conspicuous heterodoxy would not find entrance difficult. Probably there would be a long battle between the advocates and opponents of Darwinism, and the adherents of Mr. Mill and Sir W. Hamilton would respectively denounce each other as impostors.

Let us, however, look at the argument as stated by Mr. Sargent in favour of his proposal. First comes his statement that the "present let-alone system has so utterly failed that the author who undertakes to instruct the public in mental or political philosophy must do so at his own expense." He quotes, without expressly adopting, an assertion from one of our contemporaries to the effect that Smollett had reason to complain of the triviality of his own day; but we have probably lost ground since the time of Smollett. Here we have one of those dashing assertions which Mr. Sargent is generally fond of exposing. We confess that it strikes us as rash in the extreme. The period of Smollett's literary activity coincides pretty accurately with the third quarter of the last century. That is to say, he wrote at a time when philosophical speculation was as nearly as possible extinct in England, though flourishing to a certain moderate extent in Scotland; when theological writing was at its very lowest ebb; and when even political writing—with the exception of Burke's earlier performances—was of the most barren order. In other words, there was incomparably less intellectual activity manifested in any of the highest departments of thought than is the case at the present day. Poetry and fiction were represented at most by one or two eminent names. To select this period of all others for a favourable comparison with our own may be pardonable in the writer of a hasty article, but the statement will not bear serious inspection. We may surely reckon many contemporary writers of great eminence in all the topics we have noticed who are warmly appreciated, if their works are not always widely circulated. It may be that the average reading of cultivated men is composed in an undue proportion of novels and other light literature. Still, the works of such men as Mr. Mill, Sir W. Hamilton, Professor Bain, Mr. Herbert Spencer, and others, show that there is at least a keen interest in subjects which make a severe strain upon the attention. Mr. Sargent replies that the circulation obtained by some of these writers is due to their works being adopted as text-books, and that where this is not the case they cannot command the respect of publishers. He especially singles out two examples, Mr. Herbert Spencer and Mr. Macleod, the author of the Dictionary of Political Economy. The neglect of Mr. Macleod's writings may be due either to the bigoted orthodoxy of political economists, or to the intrinsic weakness of his arguments. Mr. Herbert Spencer, we will freely agree, is a gentleman whose labours deserved wider and speedier recognition. We may say, indeed, that there never was a period at which a writer who dealt with such difficult subjects, and in so abstruse a style, could hope for speedy popularity. Even Hume's philosophical works, though Hume was a master of lucid exposition, were slow to excite attention. We fear that, under any circumstances, a man who chooses that difficult path to fame must generally wait long, and encounter many obstacles before he reaches his goal. It is said of one or two of our ablest mathematicians that there are not six men in Europe who can understand their writings; of course they cannot expect the circulation of a popular novel. And though Mr. Spencer can be understood by a much larger class, his appreciative readers must be reckoned by hundreds instead of thousands. We may observe incidentally that the abundance of ephemeral literature, though it produces many evils, at least enables a man of this class to obtain a hearing. The light fiction acts as a cork jacket to float the philosophical pudding, and it would be unfair to deny that in our best reviews and magazines there is much writing of a really high class which obtains a tolerable remuneration, and helps to spread new ideas, though slowly.

Admitting, however, that a rising philosopher does not enjoy due facilities for gaining a hearing, and that men of ability are sorely tempted to discount their brains by applying them to inferior work, and admitting even that the evil, if not growing, does not diminish, let us look at the remedy suggested. Let us assume that we have an impartial and intelligent Board for securing the appointment of the fittest men. It may be pretty confidently assumed that, though they would confirm, they would seldom anticipate, the verdict of the class competent to form an opinion; and it may be assumed, for Mr. Sargent admits it, that they would look with disfavour on too daring innovation. Then we might hope that, if an able man succeeds in publishing a work of real merit, if he is not too bold in his speculations, and if he wins the good opinions of able critics, he may receive in addition the honour of belonging to a literary order of merit. Is this the

\* *Essays by a Birmingham Manufacturer.* By W. L. Sargent. Vol. III. London: Williams & Norgate. 1871.

kind of inducement which would lead an able man to devote his life to enduring work instead of mere hand-to-mouth literature? There would be, on the very most favourable supposition, a slight increase of prestige to an honourable career, from which we must make some deduction on account of the jealousies that would inevitably be excited. There would be a little more praise, but would there be any more solid pudding? A man prefers writing flashy articles which help him to pay his bills to writing metaphysics which only bring him beggarly praise. Mr. Sargant's plan appears to be, to give him a little more praise, of rather doubtful quality. Surely this is a very feeble remedy for the evil described. And even to make it plausible, we have to make the very doubtful assumption that the desired tribunal can be instituted; for, like many other reformers, Mr. Sargant glides rather too dexterously over the really doubtful part of his plan. Just grant me, he says, an all but infallible tribunal, and their praises will work wonders; just grant us a wise body of constituents, say some political innovators, and we will have a perfect Parliament. We do not deny either proposition, but we fear that both are of about equal value; and, as we see, even in the case supposed, the imaginary body to be constituted could not even attempt the one thing which on Mr. Sargant's showing is most desirable—namely, to discover the young man who has not yet done his work, and assure him the means of doing it with tolerable confidence of not starving.

We are not bound to suggest any alternative scheme, but we will venture to say thus much. Two things seem requisite to realize Mr. Sargant's ideal. First, the whole level of the highest class of education must be raised. A public to appreciate must be created as well as teachers to instruct; and that is a tolerably onerous task. We may hope that it will be worked out in time, but it must be the work of years or generations. Secondly, the speculative thinker must have a career opened to him which will make him more independent of the general public. Such a career is, in fact, provided more or less by the professorships at German Universities; and it would be superfluous to point out how many of the profound thinkers who have increased our knowledge have been supported by such means. If our English Universities awoke to the necessity of some efforts in this direction, and provided more liberally for persons engaged in original investigations as well as for those engaged in cramming youths with results already obtained, something of the same kind might be done in England. There are many symptoms that the want is being felt and supplied. We should look much more to changes of this kind than to the institution of an order of merit; though it may be that, for certain purposes, of which we need say nothing, as they are irrelevant to Mr. Sargant's argument, an English Academy might be of some use. We are rather sceptical on this point, but we are open to argument. The one duty which we should say emphatically that an Academy is not likely to discharge effectually is the encouragement of fresh talent to devote itself to original inquiry.

#### A SHADOW OF DANTE.\*

DAUGHTER of one of Dante's most learned commentators, and sister of one of his most accomplished translators, Miss Rossetti has strong hereditary claims to the office of his interpreter. She has produced a book not unworthy of the name which she bears. Her aim has been to shadow forth an outline of the *Divina Commedia* in such a way as to bring into prominent relief its most important features, and to enable the student, by gaining acquaintance with the dominant conceptions which underlie the great poem and bind together its several parts, to understand it as a whole:—

My plan is very simple. After in some degree setting forth what Dante's Universe is as a whole, and what autobiography and history show his life-experience to have been, I proceed to expound in greater detail—here and there unavoidably with slight repetition—the physical and moral theories on which his Three Worlds are constructed; and to narrate, now in his own words, now in a prose summary, the course of his stupendous pilgrimage.

Conformably to this plan, the first chapter contains a concise but lucid exposition of Dante's conception of the universe—that strange medley of Ptolemaic astronomy, Aristotelian metaphysics, and scholastic theology, which so utterly bewilders those who, without a guide, attempt to track the pilgrim's journeyings through the material and immaterial worlds. Then follows a short biographical sketch which, passing lightly over controverted points, contents itself with setting out those events of Dante's public and private life which mainly illustrate his poem. Miss Rossetti does not, it should be noted, subscribe to her father's heresy of resolving Beatrice into an allegorical abstraction, but accepts her as an historical personage, the daughter of Folco Portinari, and the wife of Simon de' Bardi. How far "the lady of the window," whom Dante describes as having won his affections for a brief space after the death of Beatrice, had any flesh and blood existence it is more difficult to say. In the "Vita Nuova" she is called "the adversary of Reason." Yet in the "Convito" she is said to be "the most beautiful and most noble daughter of the Emperor of the Universe, to whom Pythagoras gave the name of Philosophy." How is this discrepancy to be explained? Miss Rossetti throws some light on

the subject by comparing certain passages in the *Purgatorio*, from which it appears that Dante's life was at this period more or less one of sensual gratification and earthly aim. Hence she conjectures that the philosophy which at this time ruled his life was theoretical rather than practical, and worldly rather than heavenly, and in that sense might be described as opposed to that moral, spiritual, and religious philosophy which he identifies with Beatrice, his earlier and purer love. Having learnt something of the poet's life and the world in which he conceived himself to live, we are brought to the two opening cantos of the *Inferno*, which are an introduction to the whole work, and which, therefore, Miss Rossetti explains in some detail, bringing especially to bear upon them the moral and political theories contained in Dante's treatise "De Monarchia." Then comes a geographical description of Dante's Hell, followed by a summary account of his pilgrimage through it. The same plan is adopted with the *Purgatory* and the *Paradise*. First, we have the region mapped out to us from the indications scattered up and down the poem, and from the hints which may be derived from his other works; and then follows a narrative of his journey, the principal episodes of which are told, so far as is possible, in the poet's own words. Hence the work consists largely of extracts from the *Divina Commedia* itself, the translations used being that of Mr. W. M. Rossetti for the *Inferno*, and that of Mr. Longfellow for the other two parts.

It must not, however, be inferred from this description that Miss Rossetti's book is a mere cento or compilation. It professes indeed to be no more than a guide-book, and the authoress will have attained her object if she spurs on her readers to the study of the original. But it bears traces throughout of having been due to a patient, loving, and appreciative study of the great poet, as he is exhibited, not merely in the *Divina Commedia*, but in his other writings. The result has been a book which is not only delightful in itself to read, but is admirably adapted as an encouragement to those students who wish to obtain a preliminary survey of the land before they attempt to follow Dante through his long and arduous pilgrimage. Of all poets Dante stands most in need of such assistance as this book offers. The very least of his difficulties is the linguistic difficulty. The translations of his poem in our own language are numerous, and many of them are considerably above the average of excellence. And those who are not content with translations may be assured that, to one who possesses a very moderate acquaintance with modern Italian, the archaisms of the original will present no insuperable obstacle. The real difficulties which cause the *Divina Commedia* to be so little, or we should perhaps rather say so partially, read, are—first, its length; secondly, the encyclopedic character of Dante's mind; and, thirdly, his enigmatical and allegorical mode of writing. With the *Inferno*, especially with its earlier parts, there is a tolerably widespread acquaintance; many of its passages have become commonplaces, with most of its scenes the painter's art has made us familiar. But those who have only read the *Inferno* have formed a very imperfect notion of what Dante was. They have been entranced by the stern and solemn majesty of his verse; they have marvelled at the vividness of portraiture with which he has bodied forth to our gaze things unseen; they have listened to his unhesitating, unifying, inexorable judgments on sin and crime, even on weakness and error; they have been in part awestruck, and in part repelled, by the forms of torture, half ghastly and half grotesque, which he has conceived; they have lamented perhaps the bitterness to which misfortune, and injustice and exile had turned a noble and lofty soul. But of the tender and passionate sonneteer of the "Vita Nuova," of the metaphysician of the "Convito," of the political theorist of the "De Monarchia," they have caught scarcely a glimpse. Those who would attempt to understand the vast and manifold purpose of the poem, and see how Dante has gathered up into it the sum of all his thought and experience and knowledge, must not be content with pausing at the threshold of the *Purgatorio*.

Nevertheless it must be admitted that in the two later books the difficulties which have beset the reader of the *Inferno* gather more thickly, and assume a somewhat different character. Hitherto we have been treading on ground which, if strange and fantastic, is solid; we have been brought in contact with palpable objects; henceforward we are approaching the regions where time and space are not. Hitherto the bulk of the poem has been occupied with descriptions; henceforward abstract disquisitions fill an increasingly large space. The marvellous series of pictures which the *Inferno* presents has fascinated, and will always continue to fascinate, thousands who know nothing of, and care nothing for, Dante's philosophy. The lovers whirled ceaselessly round, like storm birds, in the blast; the burning city of Dis, the dismal wood of suicides, the shattered crags, "like the ruined cliff by Trent," the sea of ice, with its ghastly prisoners—these, and a hundred other pictures are familiar to multitudes who are not careful to distinguish the moral grounds on which Dante apportions his penalties. Doubtless here also the assistance of a commentator is constantly needed to tell us something more of the criminals who throng the nine circles of the pit, and to explain obscure allusions which were intelligible enough to an Italian of the fourteenth century. But it is one thing to explain references to historical persons and events; quite another thing to render intelligible to the reader alien modes of thought, and to enable him to comprehend the most abstruse speculations of a highly speculative age. And this is the kind of help which is required for an appreciation of the greater part of the *Purgatorio*, of almost all of the *Paradiso*. Hitherto we have been mingling in the

\* *A Shadow of Dante; being an Essay towards studying Himself, his World, and his Pilgrimage.* By Maria Francesca Rossetti. London, Oxford, and Cambridge: Rivingtons. 1871.



active, turbulent, many-sided society of the Italian States; we have watched their hatreds, their envies, and their factions; we have become acquainted with their most characteristic forms of vice. Now we find that Dante was not only the keen observer of his countrymen's ways and manners, and the denouncer of their corruptions, but that he gathered up in himself all that his age knew of science, of philosophy, and of theology. It is not without reason that in the "Paradise" the poet sternly warns back those who in their tiny bark attempt to follow him across the vast ocean which he now explores. In the "Paradise" we find ourselves in a world whence all that is palpable and material has vanished, where nothing is left but light and sound. Our unpurged eyes are too weak to discern the Saints who shine "like pearls on a white forehead." Our bodies are too gross to follow the flight of him who was caught up by the inspiration of divine love into the seventh heaven, who heard things unutterable, and to whom the very mystery of the Most High was laid bare. We feel that we have trespassed into a region which lies beyond the proper bounds either of poetical or of pictorial art; a region into the neighbourhood of which a symphony of Beethoven may sometimes lift us, but which even the pen of Dante is unable to describe, even the pencil of Tintoretto is unable to depict. Not that Dante ever becomes vague or hazy even in dealing with the most abstract subjects. He treads as firmly on thin air as on solid earth; he lays down principles of science and articles of faith with the same unhesitating confidence with which he condemns political opponents to eternal tortures; when he is catechized by St. John on the profoundest truths of Christianity, he answers in such a way that the very Saints applaud. Where Dante is obscure, his obscurity is owing, not to any mistiness in his conceptions, or want of precision in his language, but partly to the fact that he employs a terminology, and reasons upon a philosophical system, which to us have become unfamiliar, and partly to the fact that he deliberately tries to convey by the same words a double, or even a manifold, meaning. This allegorical mode of writing arose from a habit of thought deeply ingrained in the mind of Dante and of his age—a habit traceable, doubtless, in some measure to the allegorical mode of interpretation which had become traditional in the Church, and which was found an admirable means of reconciling discordant authorities, but traceable still more to the whole spirit and tenor of mediæval philosophy. One who was always viewing the material world as the mere hull and husk of the infinite idea, who looked upon matter, not as a means through which, but as a delusion and impediment in spite of which, truth might be attained, naturally strove to express himself in language which should correspond to the shifting and manifold meanings of external things. This habit of thought never took a lovelier or more exquisite form than in Dante's youthful love for Beatrice—a love which burnt with a flame so intense that he would swoon at her mere presence, yet so utterly white and pure from all stain of earthly passion that it became identified with his aspirations after perfect truth and goodness. To him Beatrice is not a creature of flesh and blood, but an embodiment of heavenly love and truth, lent to this earth for a time. He sees her in his dreams, sometimes as an angel of heaven, sometimes as led towards him by Love, who explains that he and she are indeed one and the same. She represents to him not one, but all, forms of the human ideal; all the highest objects after which man's soul yearns, whether knowledge, or love, or peace, or purity, or communion with God, find their expression in her. Just as Beatrice is made to represent different phases of Dante's ideal, so the other objects which he describes, or symbols which he employs, are meant to convey double or shifting meanings. There can be no doubt that the three beasts who bar Dante's escape from the wood signify the three Powers, France, Florence, and the Papacy, who impeded Italy in her attempt to escape from the bewildering maze of factions to a settled and orderly polity. But there can be as little doubt that, viewed from another side, they are the three cardinal vices, lust, ambition, and avarice, which bar man's escape from the tangled thicket of conflicting passions to the hill of virtue. The mode of writing in such a way as to reflect different aspects of meaning, which is aptly described by Miss Rossetti as "prismatic," is explained by Dante himself in the letter by which he dedicates the third part of his poem to Can Grande, and in which he speaks of his great work as being "polysemum" (πολύσημον), "having many senses," and illustrates his meaning by pointing out the fourfold interpretation—literal, allegorical, moral, and anagogic—of which the words "In exitu Israel de Egypto," quoted in the *Paradiso*, are susceptible.

The difficulties to which we have referred are not such as either a commentary or a translation entirely removes. A marvellous unity pervades the *Divina Commedia*, and its several parts are only intelligible by reference to the whole. It is for this reason that we welcome such a book as Miss Rossetti's, which enables the student to obtain a summary glance at the general purpose and meaning of the whole poem before he studies it in detail. It is not our purpose here to discuss the merits or demerits of the translations which Miss Rossetti employs, and of the merits of her own part of the work we have already spoken in general terms. Where we have compared her summary with the original we have found her a faithful guide and a lucid interpreter. And her style, which is throughout refined and graceful, rises at times to an archaic dignity which is admirably suited to her subject. We shall content ourselves with two passages which well illustrate her powers of description and of exposition.

#### The first is from the description of Dante's Hell:—

This castle is the highest point of attainment for non-believers; here abide their heroes and heroines, the great ones of their active life; here, too, and in somewhat higher place, their poets and sages, the great ones of their contemplative life. Consciously as locally suspended between reward and punishment, baulked and baffled in their whole nature for lack of that which is above nature, keenly sensitive to every wounding token of their separation from the Blessed; thirsting still for the perfect knowledge they thirsted for on earth, and knowing they must ever thirst in vain; desiring without hope that Supreme Good of which they can form higher conceptions than can their fellow-prisoners, yet too self-controlled, as it would seem, to sigh their atmosphere out of its perfect stillness; in countenance neither sad nor glad, but of great authority; slow and grave in gaze, uttering rare speech with modulated voice; retaining the tender affections of their earthly state, and some at least compassionating in all the void with which each and all are aching—these God-sick dwellers on the edge of the "great gulf fixed" pine on and on eternally, conscious of every natural endowment of kings and priests in the Heavenly City, but wanting alike the anointing oil of grace and the crown of glory.

#### The second is from the "Purgatory":—

Each Terrace (of Purgatory) is dedicated to the purification of one of the Seven Capital Sins, the first three of which spring from Love distorted, the middle one from Love defective, the last three from Love excessive. For Love, which is in every creature the fundamental principle of action, requires two conditions for its purity and health; that in its fulness it be directed towards the Primal Goods, even towards Him, the only measure of our love of Whom is to love Him without measure, and towards Virtue which conforms us to His Image; and that upon all Secondary Goods it rest in due measure, and no more. For thus is it the seed of every virtue; but otherwise of every vice, whereby man turns the creature against the Creator. The Distorter of Love loves evil to his neighbour; if for his own exaltation he desires another's depression, he sins by Pride; if esteeming his own power, favour, honour, and fame to be lessened by participation, he desires another's destitution, he sins by Envy; if because of evil done to himself he desires vengeance on another, he sins by Anger. The Defaulter in Love loves less than he might the Highest Good, and so striving after it all too slackly sins by Sloth. The Exceeder in Love loves more than he ought some lower unfulfilling good; if this be money, he sins by Avarice; if food, by Gluttony; if sensual pleasure, by Lasciviousness; and the purification of each sin is double; active, and passive. All the penitents alike suffer bodily chastisement, vividly representative of the sin wherein they lived, or the penance wherein they failed to live. And all alike, with the whole energy of a body, soul, and spirit thrilled with agony, parched and consumed with thirst for God, spurred by examples of virtue (among which comes ever first some act or word of the Blessed Virgin), by instances of vice, exercise themselves night and day, unflinching and unflagging, in the grace contrary to the sin for which they are making satisfaction.

#### THE SYLVESTRES.\*

THE path of fiction chosen for herself by Miss M. Betham Edwards seems habitually to lie apart from the hard realities or fierce contests of life. It leads her into sunny nooks or Arcadian pastures, where life flows on in sweet, smooth, and tranquil enjoyment, little heeding the passionate cries, the criminal violence, or the desponding gloom of the troublesome and wicked world without. Her favourite scenery is of the ideal, picturesque, and idyllic sort, and her characters form groups after the manner of Watteau or of Dresden china—graceful, joyous, passionless. In *Dr. Jacob* we had a picture of this drifting, dreamy, *dilettante* kind of existence, with just enough of a catastrophe to take out of our mouths the taste of over-honied sweetness which must needs come of so uniformly luscious a feast of life. *The Sylvestres* opens to our view another Arcadia not less idealistic, not less apart from all that is vulgar, coarse, or commonplace. Our sweet pastoral vision is indeed broken in upon and dispelled by a burst of horror which, in an artistic sense, is terribly out of keeping with the light and genial tone of her design at large. So ruthless and abrupt a shivering of a fairy frost-work looks like a mere caprice on the part of the framer, unless it be intended to show that the springs of tragedy and horror are no less at her command than are the rose-water fountains of light drama or idyllic romance. Her general treatment is so playful that we scarcely know how far she is in earnest in her likes and dislikes, how far her heroes or heroines are set up for admiration or repugnance, whether she is making fun or building an idol out of their peculiar quaintnesses, whims, or points of contrast. In *The Sylvestres* we get a passing glimpse or dissolving-view of Communism; not as the grim red spectre, looming vast and terrible through the flames of Paris, but as a vision of peace, smiling in genial, loving enjoyment amid the lanes and homesteads of happy England. Whether the writer wishes to be taken for a disciple of Fourier and Blanqui, or a denunciator of their schemes, whether the Utopia of her creation in Suffolk is meant to embody her ideal of social truth, wisdom, and virtue, or to show up the idiocy, the vice, and the suicidal ruin of phalansterian doctrines, we shall in no wise learn from what she has said in *The Sylvestres*. The prophets and votaries of Socialism proclaim their visions and dream their dreams, revel a while in their earthly paradise, and in an instant pass away in a destroying flame, leaving us in doubt how far the author is in earnest with it all; whether in M. Sylvestre's burning eloquence she speaks as a counsellor of wisdom or an exponent of folly.

We are as much at a loss to what touchstone we should bring the doctrines or the experiments upon which the little community is built up as by what standard we are to try the exceptional, if not utterly abnormal and impossible, personages in whom the curious experiment is vested and carried on. Her

\* *The Sylvestres*. By M. Betham Edwards, Author of "Kitty," "Dr. Jacob," &c. 3 vols. London: Hurst & Blackett. 1871.

characters are not drawn with any firm or incisive strokes, nor is every stage in the development of the plot so marked that we can make sure of grasping and logically connecting it throughout. There have been, we are dimly given to understand, phases of the Fourieristic experiment here introduced, the history and failure of which remain matter for conjecture. In the Far West of America, in "happy Algérie," if not elsewhere, M. Sylvestre and his little knot of enthusiastic followers have had painful experience of the hard lot which awaits the regenerators of society at the hands of a crass and ungrateful world. The malice of nature in visitations of locusts, floods, or fires, and the worse spite of fierce, ignorant foes, have put out from time to time the dawning light of social regeneration. A more propitious day seemed to dawn when a Continental tour brought into contact with the suffering community a young English heiress, with warm impulses, unconscious of a mission, without parent or guardian to control her will, and with wealth enough in broad acres and her father's accumulated savings to give reality to any dictate of an impetuous heart. Ingaretha Meadowcourt is of a type, both in physical and mental endowments, to which we have got somewhat over-accustomed in modern novels; tall and well made, with strong arms, and a wealth of golden hair which sets off to admiration the deep blue of her eyes. Lady of the manor and Abbey of Culpho, near the pleasant though somewhat sleepy hollow of St. Beowulf's-bury, among the level and teeming Suffolk pastures, she is naturally the cynosure of neighbouring eyes in general, and in particular of those of the parson and the squire of the parish, though at the age of six-and-twenty no sign of yielding to the more or less timid advances of either pretender has served as a hint on the part of her who holds at will so rich an inheritance as to "what she will do with it." Mr. Whitelock, the rector, is a priestly prig, so intrusive, dictatorial, and ill-mannered, that only Ingaretha's innate good-nature and inherited discipline enable her to put up with him. By the rest of the world she is destined for Mr. Carew, whose property is next her own, and not unlike it in extent, and who has been largely thrown together with her from childhood. His devotion to poetry and the arts, springing from a dreamy, idealistic temperament, far from finding a response from the like elements of romance or enthusiasm in Ingaretha's soul, forms in truth the reason why his devotion fails to satisfy a heart which seeks its counterpart or complement in action. He is the reverse certainly of the muscular and slightly ruffianly lover who especially figures in the pages of lady-novelists nowadays. His tastes are of the moony, indecisive sort, and his modes of speech are soft and finicking. In his letters he always signs himself, in somewhat lordly fashion, "Carew," whether in pouring out his soul to Ingaretha, or invoking the counsels of his giddy and chattering sister, Lady Ghenilda Micheldever, whose husband, nowhere appearing in the book, is a peer and ambassador, and whose idolized son and heir is oddly enough called "little Micheldever." We are at a loss what particular rank in the peerage to assign to the lord of Lady Ghenilda. But among minor or vapid companionships like this Ingaretha's life seems running away without an object or a mission, when the tedium of one of her lawn tea-parties is broken by the unexpected intrusion of a pair of wayfarers of strange and tatterdemalion aspect:—

There was something inexpressibly pathetic and dignified about these wayfarers as they emerged from the dusky outer world into the gaily dressed circle lighted up by Ingaretha's golden hair, the splendid silver tea-service, and a pyramid of white roses in a crystal vase.

The man was tall, slim, and of striking appearance, with a beautiful bloom of health in his thin cheeks, and a beautiful look of boyishness about his face and figure, despite the white locks, soft as silk, that reached to his shoulder. His clothes were made and mended without any regard to the eyes of the world: the pantaloons might have been cut out of a woman's gown, the coat-pockets were so obviously unsafe that you felt sure there was nothing in them; his shoes were worn out, and the knapsack he bore was of the smallest and shabbiest; yet he planted his foot on the ground with a buoyant air, and greeted the company with incomparable grace.

The woman trudging by his side looked the older and wearier of the two. She wore a broad-brimmed straw hat tied under her chin, which gave homeliness to a face not wanting in refinement, and she carried her scare-crow garments with equal resignation but less dignity than her companion. Her complexion was burnt to a deep brown, evidently by warmer suns than ours. If there was a look in her face of a great tragedy, her large benevolent careworn features were lighted up by bluish brown eyes, brilliant as jewels, and her thin well-shaped lips betokened wit and character. She also bore a bundle, and, like the man, dropped it in order to greet Ingaretha and her guests.

"Monsieur Sylvestre!" cried Ingaretha incredulously.

"Madame Sylvestre!" said Carew, rising with hands outstretched to the pair.

Great is the surprise and strange are the comments of St. Beowulf's-bury when these outlandish visitors are installed in the best rooms of the Abbey, and the best society of the neighbourhood is invited to do them honour. Great, too, is the horror of the rector at the open preaching of the heresies of Fourier and Owen among his flock. Greatest perhaps of all is the disgust of the hard and matter-of-fact steward, Mr. Minifie, when the neatest and best-stocked farm of the neighbourhood is bought by Ingaretha and modelled as a Phalanstery on the strictest principles of the divine Fourier. A lecture-hall or temple is opened with an eloquent, though utterly unintelligible, address by M. Sylvestre. Meanwhile another couple come upon the scene, political exiles like the Sylvestres. These are Maddio, the traveller and naturalist, simple as a child, ugly, but alive with the fire of genius; and René, the journalist and poet, lovely as an Apollo, pure as an angel. Arcadia seems to have come back again, so golden are the days at Pilgrims'

Hatch. Storms, indeed, lour in the distance. Can it be that the bewitching foreigner is intended for Miss Meadowcourt? The great folks are up in arms; the lesser folks flee from contact with the Abbey and its inmates, murmuring threats of vengeance against the Phalanstery. His purity of soul and love of freedom shrinking from his manifest destiny, René takes refuge in flight, rumour ere long discovering him in prison in France for seditious writing, if not for plotting against the life of the Emperor. At the Phalanstery Ingaretha's unfailing purse staves off loss, and lends awhile an air of joyous prosperity. Clad in gorgeous attire, Ingaretha's gift and taste, M. Sylvestre rules and preaches in a benignant, lordly fashion. The gates of the Phalanstery are flung open to all the world. To the patriarch's invitation come the extraordinary brothers Carrington, two briefless barristers, who are not long in exemplifying, in the bolt they make by night, the maxim that property and theft are the same thing. There comes also the mysterious Aglaé, young, pretty, and frolicsome, whose ultimate confession of a husband and child abandoned somewhere shocks Madame Sylvestre with the conviction that here is her own daughter, left by her in years gone by, under the irresistible spell of M. Sylvestre. Manifold thus are the phases of Socialism illustrated in the little group at Pilgrims' Hatch. Poetry, music, dancing, flowers, diversity and cheer the light toils of the farm, the dairy, or the orchard. To be sure on rainy days there is a slight difference as to whose turn it is to work, and about the pigsties and dung-heaps there is a perpetual hitch. At length the full millennium is to come when René, his term of imprisonment over, and openly avowed by Ingaretha as her affianced lover, is greeted with a pomp and magnificence little in keeping, we should have thought, with communistic simplicity and equality. Ingaretha's charms, backed by Lady Ghenilda's tact and talk, have bowed the necks of the Philistines of society. A wondrous "masque of ye Golden Age," to be followed by a fairy banquet, is got up for all the great people of St. Beowulf's by Carew, Ingaretha feasting the delighted villagers. In happily snatched intervals the lovers talk of schemes of social regeneration to follow a short tour of preparatory study and experiment among the model communities of the Far West. Here we seem on the point of seeing realized the paradise of pure and happy labour, the New Harmony of Owen. The more cruel, then, the shock which in an instant transforms this vision of peace and joy into a phantasmagoria of flames and blood. We are mindful that in the catastrophe thus unexpectedly prepared the writer has the precedent of recorded fact to appeal to. The fate of an unhappy Frenchman at the hands of a Suffolk rabble, not many years ago, still lingers as one of the realities which bespeak the barbarism of our times. Nor is it too far-fetched for the exigencies of a modern plot to conceive a drunken mob stamping out doctrines or experiments so newfangled and puzzling as those of our little knot of phalansterians by the blind aid of arson and murder. Herein, it may be, lies actually the most realistic or probable incident in the course of the book. Still, in an artistic point of view, we cannot but condemn it as needlessly hideous and painful, as well as in too harsh and repulsive contrast with the flimsy structure and light perisillage of the book in general. When we call to mind Hawthorne's lifelike, earnest, and well-sustained portraiture of Utopian and fantastic communities of this kind, we feel a degree of resentment at the poor, shadowy, and purposeless stuff which is palmed off upon us in *The Sylvestres*.

#### RÜSTOW'S WAR FOR THE RHINE FRONTIER.\*

MR. NEEDHAM has done a good service in translating this work, which has now been in part completed by Colonel Rüstow. Unfortunately till within the last few years the German language has been but little studied by our military men, and until Colonel Hamley came to the rescue, the military literature of this country consisted almost entirely of a mere *réchauffé* of French works of the Napoleonic era. Within the last few years this has been considerably changed. Our leading military writers have studied not only German but German authors, and have consequently been enabled to take broader views, and to discuss military matters from a wider field of survey than their predecessors. Still the number of Englishmen conversant with German is comparatively small. Whether this is due to the fact that the German character is a bar to the study of the language, or that the affinity of the two languages makes it difficult for an Englishman to master German, we cannot say. The number of our countrymen who can understand German easily is extremely limited, and of course the number of military men who do so is more limited still. Yet German military works are exceedingly valuable; they are careful, precise, and usually extremely accurate. Those of Colonel Rüstow certainly are so, as a rule, and to this rule his present work is no exception. It is therefore satisfactory that an English officer has made a translation which has placed its perusal within reach of all his comrades, especially when that translation has been made, as in the present instance, carefully and well.

The opening volume of Colonel Rüstow's work, of which the translation is now before us, is in great part devoted to the political incidents which preceded the outbreak of war between France

\* *The War for the Rhine Frontier, 1870: its Political and Military History.* By W. Rüstow. Translated from the German by J. L. Needham, Lieutenant Royal Marine Artillery. Edinburgh and London: Blackwood & Sons. 1871.



and Germany last year. In the earlier chapters the author traces the course of events in Europe from the time of the battle of Sadowa to that of the declaration of war; and from his historical retrospect he deduces the opinion that the desire of the French Government to rush into a contest with Germany was due to the necessity of gaining military prestige abroad in order to secure dynastic influence at home. The Emperor Napoleon, weakened in the popular opinion of France by the Mexican expedition and by the apathy in military organization which allowed Prussia unhindered to gain the great victory over Austria and to secure the hegemony of Germany, was forced either to bestow constitutional liberty on his people, or to dazzle them into satisfaction with their fetters by victory abroad. The former he attempted, but was afraid to complete. When he had already entered on the path of constitutional reform, he began to fear the natural consequences on the French nation; he faltered, vacillated, and finally concluded with offering to the nation reforms which were reforms merely in name, and which could not impose upon the keen-witted spirits who guided in the Corps Législatif the opposition to the Imperial policy. On the failure of these attempted reforms to satisfy the nation, there remained no resource to the advisers of the Imperial policy but to aim at victory in foreign war. The fact that Germany had dared to adjust its own affairs without the interference of the French Government was regarded in France as a national insult; and the best means to flatter national feeling in France was to take up the gauntlet to avenge that insult. This, for many months before the actual outbreak of war, the Court party of the Tuileries had been anxious to do; and, by all accounts, the Emperor, far from being the mainspring of the war, seems to have been reluctantly and with difficulty pushed forward by his advisers to the declaration of hostilities. Colonel Rüstow has clearly compiled from all available sources of information the accounts of the Cabinet Councils at St. Cloud which immediately preceded the fatal resolution of the 15th of July. Subsequent events and the well-known characters of the principal actors almost conclusively confirm the accuracy of his reading of the opening drama. He tells how the anti-Imperial tendencies in France became constantly more dangerous, till at last war was a necessity; and how the hollow pretext of the candidature of a Hohenzollern prince for the Spanish throne was worked so as to attempt to give this war, necessary for domestic purposes, an appearance of national necessity in the eyes of Europe. But the pretext of the Spanish throne deceived nobody, and France rushed into the war without sympathizers and without adherents. This was a blunder, but it was not the worst blunder committed by the French Government. A Government which declares war should be thoroughly certain that it can wage war. This the Imperial Government was not. It was completely deceived both as to its own army and as to the army of Germany. It believed the assurances of the admirers of the French army which so long deceived superficial students in this country, and staked not only the existence of France, but also its own existence, on the issue of a contest, without taking the trouble to calculate the probable number of combatants on either side that might take part therein. This is extraordinary, for there can be no doubt that after the battle of Sadowa the military advisers of the Emperor of the French perceived the necessity of a reorganization of the army. The vigorous measures adopted by Marshal Niel point emphatically to this conclusion; but on the death of that officer his improvements were allowed to fade away, and his successors seem to have imagined that, by the introduction of the Chassepot and the mitrailleuse, they would be able to win logerdomain victories over the well organized and carefully administered soldiery of Germany.

No part of Colonel Rüstow's book is more interesting than those chapters in which he draws a comparison between the French and German military organization at the commencement of the war. He shows clearly how, while the German organization and plan of mobilization was carefully and deliberately prepared and matured in time of peace, in France all had to be improvised on the outbreak of hostilities. In Germany every man knows his place, and can be immediately put in his place in the very moment of necessity. In France neither brigades nor corps were arranged beforehand, and all had to be improvised when hostilities were imminent. It was this want of forethought and this improvidence which gave the hostile army such an advantage over the French at the very outset of the campaign. This advantage was never counterbalanced; it endured throughout the war, and allowed the armies of France to be captured or dispersed without even inflicting a check of importance on their adversaries. Could not Mr. Cardwell take a few hints from those chapters which relate to the military organization of the two Powers? Might he not ask himself with advantage whether the military organization of this country has been perfected and matured in time of peace, or whether in case of war everything would not have to be improvised, even in a greater degree than in France in 1870? It cannot be doubted that such is the case. For since the Crimean War innumerable Commissions and Committees have been appointed to recommend alterations and improvements in our military organization. Some of these recommendations have been carried into effect, the greater portion have not. The result of this patchwork system of administration is that till this hour there is no real scheme of organization or mobilization in existence for the British army. It is of course easy now to point out the failures in the French organization

which led to such lamentable results; but no candid inquirer can deny that the French military organization, such as it was eighteen months ago, was immeasurably superior to our own at the present day. Yet though the French organization may have been better than that which we, after a year and a-half's experience, possess, it was far behind the German. The Austrian war had not only pointed out errors to the Prussian military administrators, but had shown them how to correct these errors. The Prussian cavalry had not achieved great results in 1866; its faults were then discovered, were extirpated in the intervening years, and in 1870 the German cavalry conducted in a high degree to the success of the campaign. This was but one instance of improvement. There were many similar. Military Prussia was, between 1866 and 1870, silently but effectively improving every day, and it was only in the hour of battle that this improvement was visible. In the meantime also in Germany a great political alteration had been effected. The States of Southern Germany had much altered in feeling since the day of the battle of Sadowa. The people of those States, if not the Governments, had forgiven the high-handed action of Prussia in 1866, and had begun to look to Prussia as the future leader of Germany towards that union which all German Liberals so ardently desired. This change of sentiment the French diplomatic agents at the minor German Courts entirely failed to perceive. Their reports, foolishly preferred to the really valuable military letters of Colonel Stoffel, misled the Cabinet of the Tuileries, and, in the hope of taking a step which would disunite Germany, the French Government hastily made the very move which any one who understood the German mind could easily have foretold would have the immediate effect of welding the German people together with an animosity against France which no minor German Government would have dared to resist.

Thus, by a fatal course of military, political, and diplomatic blundering, the Imperial Government suddenly found itself committed to war, not with Prussia alone, weakened by the apostasy of Germanic rivals, but with the whole military power of united Germany. The single advantage which the French gained in the whole course of the campaign was that some of their troops had begun to be moved towards the frontier before the declaration of war. But this early transport was of no use; for when they reached the frontier fortress the soldiers were not equipped or provided so as to be able to take the field. On the 21st of July some small detachments were pushed across the German frontier, but retired without any result worthy of the expenditure of even the few lives that were lost in them. A week passed away without any sign of the great advance of the French army. France and Europe could not believe that a war declared on such slight ground could have been declared unless all military preparations were in perfect order, and were astounded at the long silence on the frontier. France grew impatient; but the leaders of the French army could now do little to gratify the national desire. In truth, nothing was prepared. The tenders for the supplies of the army were only given in on the 28th of July, and even then there was no tender for meat which could be considered fair. It was not even possible to advance to the Rhine and check the German concentration on the left bank, or to stem the steady march of the German columns through the Palatinate or over the Eifel. It was totally impossible, as the mob vainly hoped in Paris, to push across the Rhine and destroy in detail the component corps of the German army while still engaged in their mobilization. They were mobilized before the system of supplies of the French army was arranged. The news of the declaration of war, coupled with the short, sharp order "Mobilize," was telegraphed on the evening of the 19th of July throughout Germany. In six days most of the corps were ready to move, and a force was in the field beyond the Rhine of quite sufficient strength to impede materially any French advance towards that river. The concentration of the German corps was pushed forward as rapidly as the mobilization; and by the 3rd of August the German armies were ready to advance to battle, and seek their enemy on his own soil.

To satisfy public expectation, the French army once advanced; two corps were thrown forward from St. Avold on the 2nd of August, and after cannonading the German town of Saarbrück, drove out a small garrison of Prussian infantry, and occupied the place. But even then the French leaders seem to have been totally ignorant of their adversaries' movements. The German armies were now concentrated, but the French were scattered in isolated corps along the whole frontier from Bitsch to Belfort, with a reserve at Metz. A glance at the map shows how much too widely these corps were scattered for defensive purposes; those on the flanks were too far out of hand to join in any general attack on a separated portion of the attacking enemy. Singly each was too weak to withstand attack, and they were too far removed from each other to afford mutual support. Yet, for several days previously to the actual commencement of hostilities, no attempt was made either to concentrate or support the more exposed corps. Suddenly, on the 4th of August, the Crown Prince fell on a portion of one of these at Weissenburg from the cover of the dense woods which overhang the Lauter. General Douay, who commanded the French at Weissenburg, was speedily assailed in front, and also outflanked by the German troops, which were numerically superior both here and elsewhere. The French misfortune at Weissenburg was followed two days later by the defeat of MacMahon at Wörth, and the same day the First and Second German armies stormed the heights occupied by the

French which overlooked Saarbrück. The result of these preliminary actions was that the right wing of the French army was driven in disorder through Nancy, and was never effectually rallied until it arrived at Châlons. The left wing was pushed back under the guns of the forts round Metz, where it was concentrated, and the command handed over to Marshal Bazaine.

Yet the issue of the campaign was not yet hopeless for France. It was too late to check the torrent of German invasion on the frontier, but the time had arrived with the remote view to which the forts around Metz had been constructed. This fortress was not a fortress according to the ideas of Vauban; but, surrounded in modern German fashion by a girdle of detached works, formed a large intrenched camp within which a force of indifferent troops might detain and hold passive a much larger body of superior soldiery. Had the French plans for the campaign been accurately made with a view to all possible contingencies, the situation at this time would have certainly been considered and arrangements have been made for taking a proper advantage of the great fortress. Had this been so, Bazaine might have retreated with the bulk of his force before he was committed to a series of engagements which rendered retreat impossible, leaving to a small regular force, supplemented by the provincial Garde Mobile, the custody of Metz. But so little prevision was there in the French military plans, that neither could the Garde Mobile be collected hastily in large numbers within the circle of forts, nor was the army sufficiently provided with the necessities of war to be able to march away at short notice. The consequence was, that before Bazaine could get clear of Metz, the Prussian advanced guard was upon him. The action of Borny held his rearguard for some little time, and before he could shake himself clear of his assailants in that action, and re-equip his army for a forced march, Prince Frederic Charles had crossed the Moselle above the fortress, and thrown the heads of Prussian columns across the southern line of retreat towards Châlons. In vain at Vionville did the French Marshal, with superior numbers, attempt to shake off the grip of the leader of the Second German Army. His efforts to do so cost him dear; for he was so much crippled by the results of Vionville, on the 16th of August, that he was unable to move on the 17th. By the morning of the 18th the whole German Second and Third Armies had come up and formed a semicircle, extending across both the southern and northern roads which lead from Metz to the Meuse. In the battle of the 18th Bazaine tried to break through the hostile line which barred his retreat and his junction with MacMahon. He failed to do so, and was driven back with loss within his fortifications. Here he was invested by the army of Prince Frederic Charles. With the account of these operations Colonel Rüstow concludes his first volume, and here for the present the translation ends.

We hope that it will be continued, as it is faithfully and intelligibly executed; and, as we said above, it is of importance that the work of one who was once himself a Prussian officer, and who is confessedly one of the first military critics of the day, should be placed ready at hand for the perusal and consultation of that great mass of Englishmen who do not read German works in the original.

#### CHIEF JUSTICE LEFROY.\*

THE late Chief Justice Lefroy was born in 1776, nearly a quarter of a century before the legislative union of Great Britain and Ireland, and he lived till within a few weeks of the passing of Mr. Gladstone's Irish Church Act. Before he ascended the Bench he was not only a busy lawyer but a keen and active politician; he sat in the House of Commons for eleven years, and took a conspicuous part in the violent controversies which preceded the removal of Catholic disabilities. The ninety-three years of his long life comprised an eventful and important period in the history of the kingdom, and witnessed a progressive revolution in the relations between Great Britain and the sister island. He was the eldest son of Anthony Lefroy, Lieut.-Colonel of the 9th Light Dragoons, the descendant of a Flemish family which had fled to England to escape from the Duke of Alba's persecutions. An amiable, studious, well-behaved youth, a kind of model lad in manners and behaviour, his father and tutor were equally hopeful and proud of him. He had shown "a talent for oratory," and was by general consent destined for the Bar; the only question was whether it should be the English or the Irish Bar. Mr. Benjamin Langlois, his grand-uncle, was anxious that he should come to England, and held out the prospect of obtaining a seat in Parliament through his influence with the Government. Mr. Langlois had been Secretary when Lord Stormont was Ambassador at Vienna, and when the latter went to the Home Office, he was desirous of having Mr. Langlois with him as Under-Secretary. With Mr. Bruce's groans over his unceasing labours still in our ears, it is amusing to read Lord Stormont's account of the Home Office at the end of the last century:—

I write, my dear Langlois, to invite you, not as formerly, to a share of toil and labour, but to a bed of down. I am to be Secretary of State for the Home Department. I cannot, therefore, invite you to come and work with me, for we shall have not more business in a year than we have often done in a single week; but I do most earnestly invite you to come and take your share of this sinecure. It will oblige you to come to town sooner than usual, but it will not prevent your shooting parties in the autumn.

\* *Memoir of Chief Justice Lefroy.* By his Son, Thomas Lefroy, M.A., Q.C. Dublin: Hodges, Foster, & Co. 1871.

Mr. Langlois's patronage would have been serviceable to his grand-nephew, but in deference to Colonel Lefroy's wishes, who desired his son to be near him, it was decided that he should go to Dublin University, and afterwards enter at the Irish Bar. He was "called" and engaged to be married in the same year—1797—and the marriage took place two years later in North Wales, where his bride's family had sought refuge during the rebellion. Some of her father's letters, while on service with his Yeomanry corps in the South of Ireland, illustrate the condition of the country at this time. At Waterford the rebels, after laying up a plentiful store of gunpowder and lead, stripped from houses, had planned a massacre—a public gathering of yeomen was to be held, and at an appointed hour the confederates were to rush in and murder all the Protestants. At the same time a false alarm was to be sounded through the town, and people were to be stabbed as they came to their doors to see what was the matter. "The assassins were then to rush in and put to death men, women, and children"; but the plot was balked by timely detection. In Kilkenny a similar butchery had been projected, according to the same authority, whose testimony, however, was perhaps rather a reflection of the general panic than a literal statement of facts. After an engagement at Enniscorthy, "the town and three miles of the road were almost filled with mangled corpses, promiscuously lying with dead horses, mules, pigs, &c., and the most precious furniture of elegant houses." "The rebels had 500 prisoners at Wexford, all to be sacrificed. When they determined to evacuate, they ordered immediate execution, and had only time to finish seventy, when they got information that the army was near. I saw the bridge like a slaughter-house, thick with their blood." A few days later he reports with truthfulness that "on the Court-house at Waterford are now placed the heads of Bagl. Harvey, Cornelius Grogan, John Colclough, General Keugh, and Roche." "I mention these," he adds, "as the great leaders in that country, but at Wexford they are still hanging numbers continually," under the influence apparently of discoveries of "plot after plot by poison, &c."

During the rebellion and the preliminaries of the Union, Thomas Lefroy appears to have been peacefully engrossed by his legal studies and, it may be presumed, by some more tender preoccupations. In 1800 he commenced practice, argued a Writ of Error before the Dublin Exchequer Chamber with much credit, and published a pamphlet on "Proceedings by Elegit," which roused an echo of applause even in Westminster Hall. He rose steadily in his profession. After a year or two on circuit he settled down to Equity practice. In 1808 he was appointed King's Serjeant, on the unanimous choice of the Chancellor, Chief Justice, and Attorney-General, as the most competent person for the office. In the course of the next few years he was thrice offered a puisne judgeship, but preferred to remain at the Bar. As King's Serjeant he had occasionally to serve judicially on Circuit. The first time he did so was in 1822. In the previous year, immediately after King George IV.'s visit to Ireland, the Calendar of the Special Commission in Limerick and Cork presented an appalling picture of violence and crime. The number of offenders in Cork alone was 306, of whom thirty-five were sentenced to death, some of them being ordered for immediate execution. It was intimated that the punishment to be inflicted on a number of the prisoners would depend on the future conduct of the peasantry; their lives would be spared if arms were surrendered and tranquillity restored. At the next Spring Assizes, however, the catalogue of crime was almost as black as before. It is melancholy to reflect on the startling appropriateness of Serjeant Lefroy's observations, delivered half a century ago, to some of the events of our own day:—

Let us compare the state of Ireland with that of Great Britain, and how painful is the contrast! When a murder is committed in England, the whole mass of the people appear unanimously to feel a shock, a sensation of horror which impels them to assist in the discovery of the murderer. Here the blood-stain of murder excites no feeling but one—the murderer is protected, or, if discovered, the witnesses against him are hunted down.

Mr. Lefroy was a type of a class of high-minded, benevolent, deeply religious politicians, whose confusion of mind as to the conditions of civil liberty and the limits of Government not only defeated their own ends, but fostered, and in some degree justified, the revolutionary tendencies from which Ireland is still suffering. Mr. Lefroy's politics were identified with his religion. A naturally mild, peaceful, and retiring man, he was drawn into active politics by his hereditary antipathy to the priesthood and his aggressive Protestantism. In his eyes the emancipation of the Catholics from civil disabilities was not so much a political as a religious question, and as such it could not admit of any compromise or concession which did not involve an infamous apostasy. The prominent part which he played in the agitation of the Brunswick Club against the claims of the Catholics naturally made him highly obnoxious to the latter. It was probably a blunder for the Government, which it must be remembered was of his own party, to prohibit him from sitting judicially on Circuit when occasion required it; but allowance must be made for the critical condition and temper of the country. The justice of his decisions had never been impugned; but he had an awkward habit of preaching at everybody, in season and out of season; and there was perhaps some reason to fear that he might break out into an address more suited to an assembly of Brunswicks than to the audience of a court of justice. In one of his speeches to a Grand Jury, preserved in this volume, he takes as his text the ordinary formula of indictment—"moved and seduced by the instigation of the devil"—and



leaves very little doubt as to whom he identifies with the Evil One. The Chief Justice's biographer says he will not presume to decide whether the time had not arrived when political expediency rendered it necessary to pass an Emancipation Bill, but this was really the question which was at issue in 1829, and which left the Duke of Wellington and Sir R. Peel no alternative—as they thought, and as most reasonable men have since agreed with them in thinking—but to act as they did. It has been stated that, after the Duke had fully considered the matter, he told the King frankly that either Ireland must be reconquered or the concession must be made. All the information which reached the Government pointed to the same conclusion. The Lord Lieutenant, who had previously been opposed to the Catholic claims, wrote that the agitators of the Catholic Association could lead on the people to rebellion at a moment's notice. The Chief Secretary reported that the expulsion of O'Connell from the House of Commons, or any other irritating incident, would precipitate a rising among the peasantry of the South of Ireland. It was impossible that things could remain as they were. The Catholic Association was not only lashing itself and the people into a fury, but was also exasperating the Orangemen: and the whole condition of the country was becoming so inflammable that an accidental spark might at any moment have lighted up a civil war. Perhaps it would have established a more wholesome precedent in Parliamentary government if the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel had resigned—as indeed Sir Robert desired to do—and allowed the consistent and conscientious advocates of Emancipation to propose the necessary legislation. But there were personal difficulties in the way of forming a new Government, and it was probably imagined that the Brunswickers could be more easily managed and restrained by their former leaders than by an Administration composed of triumphant opponents. It was a mistake in tactics for the Duke and his colleagues to conceal the decision at which they had arrived until the moment for action, thus affording the anti-Catholic party ground for complaining that they had been caught in an ambush. But the great and cardinal error of the Government was, as Sir R. Peel himself has almost admitted in his "Memoirs," that they adhered with too much pertinacity to a hopeless cause, and permitted "for too long a period the engagements of party or undue deference to the wishes of constituents to outweigh the accumulating evidence of an approaching necessity." Mr. Lefroy asserts that the Emancipation Bill was carried through Parliament against the known inclinations of the Sovereign, against the often recorded vote of the House of Lords, and "against the voice of the people, whose petitions were treated with contempt." The first part of this statement is true, but the assertion that the voice of the people was against the measure is certainly not true of the people of Ireland. Sir R. Peel's memorandum of January 12, 1829, shows that out of ninety-three Irish members, sixty-one in the Session of 1828 voted in favour of the Catholic claims, while, out of sixty-one county members, forty-five voted on the same side. An attempt to govern Ireland by an English majority in the face of a compact Irish majority would have caused an inevitable and dangerous deadlock in Parliamentary business.

Mr. Lefroy had not long to wait for his revenge on the Government which had excluded him from the Bench. He was returned by the University of Dublin, which he represented till 1841, just in time to join the discontented Tories, who voted with Sir H. Parnell for a Committee on the Civil List, and thus brought the Duke of Wellington's Administration to an end. Mr. Lefroy afterwards returned to his allegiance, and had the melancholy satisfaction of consistently and impotently opposing all the great measures of the next ten years. He was deeply disappointed at not getting the Irish woolstack in 1841, but consented to become one of the Barons of the Exchequer. This office he filled till he was ninety years of age, indignantly resisting the clamour which was raised by some of the Liberals, in the spring of 1866, at his holding office at such advanced years, but resigning a few months afterwards when his party came into power. Perhaps there is no adjective which may more appropriately be applied to him than "respectable." He was eminently respectable for his legal accomplishments and personal character, but he had no claim to intellectual distinction. He was essentially commonplace save in his sincere and earnest piety. As a rule, a son is an injudicious biographer, and we cannot say much in Mr. Thomas Lefroy's favour. It is natural that he should make much of small incidents and domestic matters which do not interest the general reader. The passages from the Chief Justice's family correspondence might be reduced with advantage. But the book is worth reading for its glimpses of Irish life, and on account of the typical character of the subject of the biography.

#### FLETCHER ON MODEL HOUSES.\*

THERE are three classes of persons who are interested in the question of houses for working people. In the first place, there is the ordinary builder—the man who sees that the annual increase of the population must create a constant demand for additional dwellings, and whose common sense tells him that the present type of house might be improved to his own advantage by being made more convenient to live in and less costly to build.

In the next place, there is the man who requires a certain return for the capital invested in houses, but is willing to be content with moderate interest in consideration of the good done by giving the poor better homes. Thirdly, there is the philanthropist pure and simple, the man who determines that the best way in which he can spend the money he devotes to charity is to build decent houses, and to whom therefore the interest derived from the investment is a matter of no moment. All these classes deserve every sort of encouragement. The need for houses is far too great to be met by philanthropy alone. The one agent that can be trusted to meet the demand universally is capital seeking to reproduce itself. Once make it generally known that good houses can be built so as to bring in the same rent as bad houses, and the ordinary competition of one builder with another will gradually drive the latter out of the market. The builder who wants to get business will find it to his interest, whether he is himself the landlord or not, to provide more attractive houses than those provided by his rival who is already in possession of business. But the application of philanthropy to house building has lately fallen into discredit which is only in part deserved. It is quite true that to give the working classes houses rent free, or at a lower rent than they would command at an ordinarily fair calculation, is open to the objection that it is only a disguised form of almsgiving. But there is a conspicuous advantage about this mode of doing good to your neighbour which has not hitherto been made the most of. Money spent in house-building can be made thoroughly reproductive without the disinterestedness of the man who so spends it being in the least affected. Let us suppose, for example, that a rich man has spent 10,000*l.* in this way. He may, if he pleases, charge nothing for his houses, in which case they at once sink into almshouses, and probably in the end do more harm than good. Or he may charge rents which bring him in a lower interest than that which men who build for profit can afford to be content with; in which case there is some danger of discouraging the natural flow of capital into the trade, and thus in the long run becoming an obstacle to the supply of better houses rather than a promoter of it. Or he may charge the full average rents obtainable by ordinary landlords, and devote the money towards enlarging his charitable operations. In this way his 10,000*l.*, besides benefiting the actual dwellers on his property by giving them good houses instead of bad, will in a few years' time benefit as many more by providing another 10,000*l.* to be devoted to the same object. It is not necessary, however, to wait until sums of this magnitude are provided from a single purse. We should like to see Societies organized for this purpose to which people might subscribe their guinea or their ten guineas, just as they do to a hospital. If 1,000*l.* a year were raised by this means, a beginning might be made at once; and in the second year after the houses were built there would, at 8 per cent., the ordinary rate of interest on this class of building, be 1,080*l.* available for the extension of the undertaking. This arrangement would offer a field for the second class of persons spoken of above; those who want some interest, but are willing to be content with 4 or 5 per cent. instead of 8. There may be objections to their building on a large scale themselves, but there is no reason why these persons should not lend money to the Societies described, and thus enable them to borrow money at 4 per cent., and invest it for the benefit of the charity at a considerably higher rate.

Appealing as it does to so varied a public, Mr. Fletcher's *Model Houses for the Industrial Classes* ought to find abundance of readers. He sets out clearly and briefly the defects of the houses in which working-men usually live, and the reasons why the attempts that have been made to improve them have not met with the success they merit. The great majority of the houses now inhabited by artisans are let out in apartments or flats, but with few or no exceptions they were originally built to be occupied by a single family. The result is that the basement is usually the only set of rooms that contains a proper kitchen grate; there is no apparatus for getting water upstairs; no means of washing clothes or plates and dishes, except in the living room; no separate closets, dustbins, coal-holes, or sinks for the use of each family. The meaning of all this is that in these houses "cleanliness necessitates a great amount of labour"; and since, as Mr. Fletcher truly says, wherever this is the case among the working classes "dirtiness and untidiness are found to exist, the first essential to be sought in altering their existing dwellings is to give them 'to their hand,' as they would express it, all those appliances which will lessen that labour." Of course these defects are not found in the various "model lodging-houses" that have been built of late years. But these are exposed to other objections. The rooms seem too often to be badly lighted and badly ventilated. The external staircase found in many of them is not liked by the inmates. And, above all, the poor do not as a rule like living in immense blocks of buildings. This dislike may be a mere prejudice; but if it exists in any strong measure, it is one that must certainly be considered. You cannot force people to take a particular sort of house when others are open to them; and if they prefer dirt and discomfort in a small house to cleanliness and comfort in a large one, it is the part of true philanthropy to see whether these latter requisites cannot be provided under conditions which will make them popular. Nor are the drawbacks in these buildings in any way compensated by the low cost of their erection. The cost per room of four of the London model lodging-houses varies from 6*o* *l.* to 11 *l.*; so that, as ordinary builders build at a cost of 31*l.* per room, it is not wonderful that the dividend paid to the investors in no case exceeds 5 per cent., and in one falls as

\* *Model Houses for the Industrial Classes.* By Banister Fletcher. London: Longmans & Co. 1871.

low as 2 per cent. Mr. Fletcher gives plans and details of two different types of houses which he has built at the respective cost of 35*l*. and 38*l*. per room. The increase over the outlay of the ordinary builder very inadequately represents the additional advantages. In the first case the appearance of the buildings is that of a row of two-storied cottages with the door in the middle and a room on each side. The door leads into a passage running the whole length from front to back, and, leading out into a piece of garden. Opening out of this passage are four sets of apartments, each consisting of a living room, a scullery, and two bedrooms, together with a separate closet, coal-box, and dustbin. On the upper floor a similar passage gives access to four corresponding sets of apartments. The scullery and one bedroom open out of the living room. The second bedroom is made to open either from the passage or from the other bedroom, according as it is intended to be occupied by a lodger or by one of the family.

But whatever may be the advantages of building from the foundation, it is not a possible process in the majority of cases. Open spaces in situations fitted for building are rarely to be had in London, and if a piece of ground already built on is bought, the existing houses will certainly not be left out of the calculation in estimating the purchase-money. To buy houses merely to pull them down is too costly a process for most people, and involves immense waste even for the few who can afford it. We have seen how great are the inconveniences of the type of dwelling usually occupied by the working classes. All these drawbacks are mainly traceable to one cause—the fact that the house was built with the view of being let as a whole, and is now let in apartments. Mr. Fletcher gives plans and explanations of several modes in which he proposes to meet this difficulty. The first applies to a row of three-storied houses, “a fair type of a very common class of house property in London,” and comprises the smallest advisable alteration where more than one family live in a house. The ground-floor remains structurally unaltered, with a living room in front and a bedroom at the back; but the offices in rear of the house are reserved for the use of the ground-floor tenants, instead of, as now, being common to the whole house. On the first and second floors the partition dividing the back room from the staircase is carried through to the front wall. By this means the living room is reduced to the same width as the bedroom, and in the space thus gained are introduced a scullery, closet, coal-box, sink, dustbin, and meat-safe. Mr. Fletcher wisely extends his alteration to the basement, because, however objectionable the notion of living and sleeping in a story partly underground may be, experience proves that “it will inevitably be done so long as there continue to be numerous poor who are compelled to live near their work, and so long as owners of houses continue to be determined to make the most out of their property.” By opening a door between the front and back rooms, he secures “through” ventilation, while a new partition, enclosing part of the front area, gives space for a scullery, closet, sink, and dustbin, and another in the lobby gives room for a meat-safe. A second design refers to a similar row of houses, but avoids lessening the size of the front rooms on the first and second floors by the addition at the back of a building three stories high, containing sculleries and closets for the ground, first, and second floors respectively. These are reached by new doors in the back wall of the house, opening from each landing on the common staircase. The staircase will be lighted partly by glass panels in the new doors, and partly by a new window introduced between the roof of the additional building and that of the present second floor. These designs give increased comfort and health, but no increased accommodation. Two more designs, also referring to a similar row of houses, provide a second bedroom. The houses thus dealt with are assumed to have frontages of 16 feet 8 inches between the party walls. A fifth design deals with houses having only 12 feet between the walls. Mr. Fletcher’s scheme is to convert three of these houses into two, by making each third house into offices for the houses on each side of it. The details of this conversion can hardly be made intelligible without the ground-plan, but the result is that out of the three existing houses Mr. Fletcher gets on each floor two sets of rooms, consisting of living room, two bedrooms, and scullery, instead of three sets containing a living room and one bedroom.

An interesting and most important chapter of Mr. Fletcher’s book deals with the question of cost. He estimates that his model houses will bring in in ordinary cases a certain income of 7½ per cent., and that the houses altered according to the first design will bring in an additional profit of 5 per cent., if the rents are raised only 6*d*. a week; not a great addition, as he justly says, when the increased comfort and convenience are taken into consideration. To bring in the same percentage on the second design, 9*d*. a week more must be had. The addition of a second bedroom ought to command 13*d*. more; and the three houses, which may now be calculated to bring in a total weekly rental of 18*s*., ought, when converted into two, to yield 20*s*., or 5*s*. a week for a living room, two bedrooms, and every possible convenience in the way of offices. The total return of houses of this class, if altered and let at this rent, Mr. Fletcher puts at over 10 per cent. The objection that these rents are more than the poor can pay is met by the argument that they will be occupied by a class of tenants above the very poor, who now compete with the latter for the wretched accommodation at present attainable, but will then leave houses empty which may in turn be treated in somewhat the same way. We have passed over much in Mr. Fletcher’s little book that deserves notice, but all who are interested in the subject will do well to get it for themselves. It is

the most practical contribution we have seen to the solution of the great difficulty how to provide the poor with houses which shall not be a direct incentive to disease, pauperism, and vice.

#### OUGHT WE TO VISIT HER?\*

IF Mrs. Edwardes gives her hand outright to Bohemianism, it may be admitted that she only flirts with impropriety. So far this is a saving grace, as well as an exhibition of dexterity. For the marvellous manner in which she manages to steer close to the shallows of absolute immorality, and yet never to get quite aground, is a feat of literary touch and go, surprising to say the least of it, if less than admirable in any higher sense. It is dancing among eggs, turning summersaults on the trapeze, the successful accomplishment of which brings a certain amount of credit with it; but we cannot help wondering why people choose to dance among eggs where one false step would make a very ugly mess, and why turning summersaults on the trapeze, at the risk of a broken neck in case of failure, should be considered a nobler performance than going head over heels on a mattress where no bones would be broken. But as there are audiences which like to witness these feats of bodily skill, so there are readers who enjoy books which are always verging on impropriety and never go quite over the borders; by which terms are kept with both God and the devil, and decency is not outraged, if virtue is held in fear. In this kind of skilfulness Mrs. Edwardes is one of our most notable proficient; and whatever fault we may have to find with her work on certain grounds, we must concede to her the praise of suggesting all sorts of naughtiness in apparently the most artless manner, and of going as near as may be to the infraction of the Seventh Commandment, with the prettiest air of innocence and *naïveté* imaginable. No less remarkable is the skill with which she blends the characteristics of Lais and Phyllis; so that really you do not know whether her heroine belongs by rights to the Quartier Bréda or to that mythic country of shepherdesses where innocence and short petticoats are inseparable, and simplicity is chucked under the chin without offence.

*Ought We to Visit Her?* is in many respects a repetition of the leading idea of *Archie Lovell*—the scrapes and mischances into which a young and perfectly innocent girl may fall when taken out of her unconventional, easygoing Bohemianism, and set among stiff-backed Philistines who measure morals by manners, and hold breaking the law of appearances equal to breaking the whole Ten Commandments in the lump. Archie Lovell and Jane Theobald are two presentations of the same figure; and if their histories are different, it is only the difference lying between the escapades of a young girl in love with a young man, and the flirtations and audacities of a married woman in love with her husband. In both there is the translation into orderly and stately society of a wild, unfettered, but pure-minded artist girl, with the cruel judgment of the world reading innocence by the light of its own corruption, and sure that no good can exist in the people who do not bow the knee to Mrs. Grundy. And in both there is the same absurd mistake of extreme youth; Mrs. Edwardes making the usual blunder of thinking she can harmonize the *morale* which comes to a woman only after a certain amount of experience has been passed through with the face and figure of a girl in her teens. Jane Theobald is practically five or six and twenty; but the authoress holds to the sacred tradition of nineteen, having been however obliged to marry her heroine off-hand when a child of sixteen, to save the magic of “under twenty” to the mother of a daughter three years old. And this gives one the first sense of that inconsistency which runs through the whole book. True, there are no violent incidents to shock one’s feeling of social security, and make one ask “Where were the police?” no stranglings in the dark, no poisonings by familiar friends, no melodrama of any kind; but there is a monstrous amount of improbability all the same; and though the machinery works easily and without spasmodic action, one questions the shape of the hinges, and doubts the method of the carpenter in more places than one. Nothing looks like life as we know it; and nothing is as it would have been among people possessing their ordinary intellects, and neither idiots nor maniacs. And no one is thorough. Every one is just something else than the character for which he or she stands; and the reader’s mind is tormented with doubts as to what is gold and what brass. Thus Mr. Theobald, confessedly a gambler, and by the laws of Philistine morality a scapegrace otherwise—is he or is he not a blackleg to boot? When “Adonis” Harvey says of him that he “turns the King a little too often towards the small hours of the morning,” is it simple spite, or has it a meaning? It seems to us that Mrs. Edwardes faltered in her drawing of the handsome, nonchalant, good-tempered gambler; and that at one time she meant to give him an extra touch of pitch, and make him more of a scamp than he turns out eventually; else what is the significance of the little “Molinos” episode? and what the meaning of the “quick look, not exactly of displeasure, but of something very different to (sic) their usual lazy expression, which passes from Mr. Theobald’s handsome grey eyes,” when Jane says, “Mr. Crobie is going to talk to me, and not play *écarté* to-night, Theobald, and all nights, too, if he take my advice”? It looks like rooking; but in the end Theobald comes

\* *Ought We to Visit Her?* By Mrs. Edwardes, Author of “*Archie Lovell*,” &c. 2 vols. London: Richard Bentley & Son.



out with dove's feathers and clean hands enough; and though De Lانسac, his bosom friend, is spoken of as a *chevalier d'industrie*, *nosctur ex sociis* does not seem to apply in this case. Again, what is Jane really? When Theobald looks at her after her speech to him quoted above, and says "good-humouredly, but with emphasis," "You may depend upon it, my dear Jane, Crosbie is too gallant a man to refuse such an alternative," why does Jane "bite her lip, colour, and hang her head"? why has "the remark evidently told"? and why does De Lانسac "understand domestic storm-signals," and "throw himself boldly between man and wife"? Elsewhere we find that Jane and her husband are lovers still, so this use of De Lانسac would seem to be problematical. They are ardent lovers, notwithstanding that she is a fiery, wilful little lady, always ready to get up a demonstration, either of love or anger, on the shortest notice; but then Theobald is lazy, unexcitable, good-tempered, and fond of being amused. She is just the kind of thing he likes, and by pulling a string he can make his puppet dance to any tune he will, and witness a rousing domestic drama without cost or trouble. Probably the plan was changed while the work was in progress, and the reader thus escaped certain complications of iniquity which Mrs. Edwardes, as she went on, found to be burdens rather than enrichments.

As for Jane herself, she is a contradiction like every one else, and as we said before, blends so cunningly the characteristics of Lais and Phyllis that we scarcely know where to have her. She is a Bohemian *pur sang*, having begun life as a prospective ballet-dancer in a darned merino frock, when Mr. Francis Theobald, seeing her just as she has got her first engagement, asks her abruptly, after the fashion of Englishmen, which she will take—him or the stage? She takes him, and throws up the stage. Since then they have lived about abroad; their portable possessions consisting of a workbox, a meerschaum pipe, and, as time went on, a Blossy, and Blossy's doll; and since then, too, Jane has been made acquainted with debt, disgraceful gambling transactions, and the ups and downs of that half-adventurer's career not uncommon with the Continental Englishman. Yet, in spite of their associates—De Lانسac, the *chevalier d'industrie*, being the closest—and in spite of their doings, Jane remains as innocent of the naughtiness of the world as her own child, and as fresh as a daisy. Then, again, she is loyal in love with her husband; but she calls men by their Christian names on a first introduction, and intentionally leads them on to become madly in love with her, whether they are engaged or free. She means no harm, however, by her barefaced coquetries; she means only to spite the ladies of the family or the district who will not visit her, by showing her power over their male belongings. When, as in the case of Rawdon Crosbie, she is brought face to face with the mischief she has done, she falls back upon her ignorance, and preaches common sense to her victim with edifying self-possession. But which is true—her coquetry or her innocence?

This Rawdon Crosbie, too, gives the orderly critic, who likes to understand what he reads, no little trouble. An honest and honourable young fellow as he is, a high-spirited officer, would he, in the first place, have proposed for poor fat foolish Emmy merely because his mother wished it, and he had been brought up with that idea—not taught, only encouraged—and because Emmy had thirty thousand pounds? Well, granting that he would have taken this step, that he could, with any self-respect at all, have made her an offer—or rather not have made it, only implied it, for very weariness of soul and blankness of heart, and feeling unable to speak—would he then have played fast and loose with his own happiness, his honour, poor Emmy's peace of mind, and Jane's repute, by dangle about a married woman as he did? too virtuous to come to the point and boldly endeavour to seduce her, too weak to stay away and try to forget her, too irresolute to give up Emmy or to keep her—in fact, too little of a man to act with the self-restraint or determination of a man, and yet not brave and reckless as a boy would have been? Neither an honest lover nor a seducer, he holds the middle place of philanderer; yet by physique and small incidental touches, he is evidently designed by the authoress to be a very fair specimen of the English officer and gentleman; and selling himself to a girl he does not love, and making love to a married woman, are not held to be disqualifications for the title. As enigmatical is the important episode of Mr. Theobald's flirtation with Lady Rose Golightly. What it all means, where it is to lead, and when it is to stop, it is beyond the power of the ordinary reader to foresee. Lady Rose is in love with Mr. Theobald, Mr. Theobald is in love with his wife; yet Lady Rose, who is neither young nor handsome, can allure and keep for days the lazy gambler and *bon-vivant*, to his utter forgetfulness of the claims or the jealousies of Jane; and can even carry him off in her brother's yacht at a time when he knows Jane is furious against them both, and in danger, of her own provoking. One cannot tell of course how far the author intends us to believe this liaison with Lady Rose has gone; and it would be rude perhaps to surmise. She may mean only the appearance of evil, with the substantiality of virtue left intact; most probably she does; and, if so, then we must include her in the censure due to writers who play with edged tools, and pretend they do not cut; who trade on human passions up to a certain point, and then, as soon as they would become inconvenient, ignore their imperiousness and the unalterable logic of consequences, and ask innocently, "What have I done? Did I say that they had gone wrong?" We heartily wish our lady-novelists would keep clear of that mania for adultery in their

stories which has bewitched them for so long. Here, in an innocent-seeming book, we have—1, an intrigue between a married man and a married woman, whether absolutely criminal or not we are left to conjecture; 2, a young man, honestly engaged to a good girl, if fat and short of wind, frantically in love with a married woman, who sees his state well enough, and keeps him in his chains, only at the eleventh hour relenting, and restoring him to his friends and his better senses when she has no further use for him; 3, the same married woman making all preparations to run away from the husband she adores, to become the paid mistress—it must be understood that the question of payment is touched on by Mrs. Edwardes herself—of a man she loathes and despises; with, 4, any number of minor *affaires* of varying depths of intensity. Yet *Ought We to Visit Her?* says nothing to shock the verbal delicacy of the most fastidious; and if the *motif* of the story had been purer, it would have been a really pretty book. There was a great deal to have been made of Jane's innocent Bohemianism and Chalkshire Philistinism. Her unconventionalities might have been brought more prominently forward, and in more amusing contrast with their starched primness. She might have been Bohemian, and yet not bad; but, as she is drawn now, she almost justifies the grim Chalkshire exclusion; for when a woman meditates and carries out to its first stage an elopement from her child and her husband, to enter into the service of an abominable kind of satyr, for pay, simply out of jealousy, she has not much solid basis of good, and we would not give much for the love (in capitals) through the force of which she escapes from the jaws of death at the end. We wish Mrs. Edwardes would use the powers she has to better ends. We are obliged to say that *Ought We to Visit Her?* is a step downward, and on a wrong track altogether; but it had good elements in it, if the author would have trusted more to her own observation and less to her estimate of the vitiated taste of the public; and we may also add, that if she would be a little more exact in her grammar she would gain considerably as a writer.

## AMERICAN LITERATURE.

THERE is probably no department of literature or science in which Americans themselves would question the superiority of England, either as regards average quality or quantity of production. The public documents of the States, indeed, are, as our readers well know, of far more varied and general value and interest than our own, and many scientific and practical works of the highest merit have been and are yearly published at the expense of the country. But even though thus aided, there is no branch of study to which the entire recent contribution of America is anything like as important as our own. And in no class of books, perhaps, is this inferiority more manifest than in those intended for the use of schools and colleges. But we must make one important exception alike to the general rule and the particular example. Upon geography and kindred subjects Americans have written much and carefully, stimulated and assisted no doubt by the energetic encouragement which the Federal Government has constantly given to exploration of every kind in almost every part of the Western Continent. Geographers proper, geologists, mineralogists, and naturalists have been enabled to pursue their inquiries at the public cost, and have been encouraged to painstaking investigation and to the publication of ample records of their discoveries by the interest which all classes of Americans have always manifested in these subjects. It is no doubt to their peculiar situation, as a people of high civilization and unresting enterprise, in possession of an immense, rich, and imperfectly known territory, that this interest is due; and it has led apparently to a study of geography much more general and thorough than is common in English schools. As the demand creates the supply, the American text-books of geography are often more complete, and certainly much better calculated to fulfil their purpose of instruction, than our own. Dr. M. L. Maury's series\*, one of which we have already had occasion to notice, are especially adapted to excite the curiosity of boys and girls, and to make that which, as taught to our children, is about the dulllest and most tedious of all dry matters of routine, the agreeable and interesting subject it ought to be. The volume now before us is fitted to be the delight of any schoolroom in which the teacher is not utterly and hopelessly unfit to teach. It contrives to make the geographical definitions to which children so rarely learn to attach a meaning intelligible at sight, by an illustration in which each of the common terms of physical geography—continent, island, sound, strait, ocean, sea, mountain, tableland, &c.—is clearly presented to the reader's eye. It contains, not only the ordinary maps which show the political demarcations of mankind, but physical maps in which the great natural features of every region are shown with equal distinctness. And, finally, a multitude of illustrations attach a living interest and visible meaning to the multitude of names and facts which form the drudgery of geography; presenting to the sight and intelligence of the pupil characteristic scenes which his memory will ever after associate with the names of capitals, the course of rivers, the local scenery, flora, fauna, history, and industrial occupations which the

\* *Maury's Geographical Series: Manual of Geography; a Complete Treatise on Mathematical, Civil, and Physical Geography.* By M. A. Maury, LL.D., Author of "Physical Geography of the Sea," &c. New York: University Publishing Company. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1871.

writers of English text-books expect him to learn by rote. We can heartily recommend this volume and its companions to the use of every family and to the junior classes of every school; and we are sure that where it is adopted the geography lesson will become suddenly and surprisingly popular.

Mr. Robert Somers's work on the Condition of the Southern States since the War\* is full of interesting and valuable information. The writer is remarkably free from prejudice, is certainly not prejudiced in favour of the Southern cause, and he avoids as far as possible all reference to the political conflicts which preceded and brought about secession. When his subject compels him to speak of politicians and political measures, he studiously confines himself to an account of the facts and practical evidences of the working of Republican policy which he himself witnessed; but his main purpose is to exhibit a full and fair picture of the social and industrial state and prospects of the South. He has traversed nearly all the conquered States, and conversed with all classes of their inhabitants; he has been a careful and impartial observer, and the record of his observations is therefore as satisfactory and trustworthy as any descriptive work of travel that we have lately seen. His temperate language and perfect candour disarm suspicion and distrust; and even those admirers of the Federal policy who have tried to persuade themselves and the public that the South is prospering under a government of negro votes and Northern bayonets will be compelled to accept his evidence. That evidence shows—incidentally and not of direct purpose—that the war was waged with a wanton and savage ferocity on the part of the North that recalls the devastation of the Palatinate by Louis XIV. The wholesale conflagration of cities and homesteads, the devastation of cultivated lands, the destruction of all factories, machinery, railroads, buildings, all the accumulated wealth of generations, has reduced the South to utter poverty; and her entire wealth in 1870 was hardly more than half of what it had been in 1860. Moreover, though no executions for high treason marked the close of the war, the Reconstruction policy displays a more vindictive spirit than the infliction of death upon a few leaders would have done. It is the infliction of a cruel and degrading punishment upon a whole nation. The Test Act excludes from office every man of character and repute in the South, and practically disfranchises the majority of the white people; so that the States are ruled by Northern adventurers of the lowest class, elected by negro votes; men of the stamp of Fisk and Tweed, who have treated the Carolinas as those gentlemen treated the Erie Railway and the municipality of New York. Such a Government of course discourages immigration, and frightens away capital; and, in spite of the immense resources of the country and the heroic energy of the people, the South is poorer than she was twenty, or probably thirty, years ago. Mr. Somers's accounts of the character, conduct, and demeanour of the freed negroes are interesting, but do not at all confirm the hopes of those who suppose that the experiment of emancipation will be more successful in the South than in Jamaica. Altogether, the picture drawn of the condition of the country might satisfy the most vindictive of Northern Radicals, and is deeply painful to any one who, whatever his opinion of the justice or constitutionality of secession, whatever his abhorrence of slavery, cannot help sympathizing with the calamities of a gallant nation, crushed by overwhelming numbers while struggling for what they considered to be their national rights and inherited liberties.

Among the most valuable American publications of the year is a sort of Dictionary of Derivations†, commenced in May last, of which the four first monthly parts are now before us. It will take years, apparently, to accomplish it; but in the meantime each succeeding number contains matter enough for a month's study, and the completed work will probably be so expensive that only by this method of gradual issue would it be likely to find any large number of purchasers. The writers aim at great completeness and accuracy in their accounts of the origin, history, and connexions of each of the words given; and while we forbear in this place to express an opinion upon the merits of their writing or the correctness of their judgment, we may say that the Dictionary promises to be a work of great importance, as it is one of high pretensions, and undoubtedly of enormous labour. We may notice, perhaps, that in some cases insufficient allowance is made for the dulness of many readers. Thus the derivation of *arctic* from *ἀρκτος* is given; but the reader is left to find out for himself the relation of the Polar regions to the bear; and he is perhaps as likely to refer it to the creatures he has seen in the Zoological Gardens as to the constellations that borrowed their name. The type and paper, as usual in the more ambitious class of American publications, are well worthy of the text.

*Odd Hours of a Physician* ‡ belongs to a class of books of which we have certainly had rather too many of late; mere collections of essays, unconnected, or imperfectly connected; each thoughtful perhaps and sensible in itself, but from their very nature fragmentary in scope and treatment, and therefore appear-

ing to better advantage in the pages of a magazine than when bound together as a book; the more so that in a magazine they are intermixed with other matter of a wholly different character, whereas when collected together they are just sufficiently distinct to lack all the value of continuity, and sufficiently alike to miss the charm and relief of variety. The "Physician" writes partly as a man of the world, and partly as a man of science; in either case in the tone and spirit of a moderate Conservative; and if we have read much better essays, we have more often read much worse.

A somewhat similar, but more lively and less solid, congeries of fragments, is Mr. Powers's volume\*, of which the *Muskingum Legends* form but a very small part, and which consists of two principal portions—a series of American legends and stories, and a series of sketches and papers apparently written for the press during a tour or residence in Germany. The level of Mr. Powers's writing is fairly indicated by a suggestive remark in his preface, to which his title-page refers, that despite the youth of the American nation, the American character has in it far less of youthfulness than that of European peoples—far less of the elasticity, vivacity, and enjoyment of life that belongs to youth, and more of the constant business thought and practical care that is the characteristic of age. This remark contains a truth which a careless observer, or a mere repeater of other men's ideas, would have missed; but misses—what a really thoughtful man would have noted—the hopefulness, the inexhaustible energy, the irrepressible power of recovery from disaster which mark the Americans as a people who have at least the vigour, if not the lightness, of youth.

For the sake of its great usefulness we so far depart from our usual practice as to mention once more a work we have noticed already, an excellent, practical, cheap and simple Handbook for Emigrants†, from which intending settlers in America can learn almost all that it most behoves them to know, and which is full of valuable hints and warnings. Of less value, and appealing to a different class of readers, but useful enough to those who visit the States for pleasure, is Mr. Appleton's "Western Tour" ‡, a guide to the region still popularly called the Western States, as well as to the central wilderness on either side of the Rocky Mountains, the mining district, and the vast agricultural wealth and splendid scenery of the Pacific Coast. The names of places are printed in larger and blacker type than the rest—fortunately for readers over middle age, to whom a text worse and more diminutive than that of *Bradshaw* is a grave difficulty.

In Dr. William Elder's *Questions of the Day* § we have a fair average specimen of American works on economical topics. The science of political economy has apparently made as little way among the thinkers and writers of the United States as its principles have made in their financial practice; and while in this country the great majority of influential journals and authors show a general acquaintance with the fundamental doctrines of Adam Smith, Mill, and Malthus, and a reasonable deference to their authority, four American political essays and treatises out of five either defend or assume theories of trade, of taxation, and of currency which in Europe have long since been exploded or left to political extremists and perverse crotcheteers—Communists and High Tories, political Ptolemaists and squarers of the circle. While on this side of the Atlantic scarcely any man who can pretend to a fair knowledge of the subject, and capacity to understand it, differs on essential points from the acknowledged masters of the science, the most eminent American writer on Economics, Mr. Carey, is the economic heresiarch of the age, and we find professors and statesmen propounding doctrines hardly more tenable than those of Sir A. Alison or Canon Kingsley. Dr. Elder is a disciple of Mr. Carey's, without a tithe of his master's ability, and with no trace of his vigour and clearness; and the main purpose of his book is the maintenance of views which, if carried out, would bring us back to the commercial legislation of the Plantagenets, when trade was regulated with the minutest care by rulers who never dreamt that, as men buy and sell only with a view to profit, the surest way to national profit must be to let them buy and sell with freedom, and when the exports and not the imports were supposed to be the valuable and remunerative part of commerce, so that a trade which exported much and brought back nothing would be held the most profitable to the country. But Dr. Elder is not only wedded to obsolete theories, but incapable of understanding palpable facts; not only paradoxical, but puzzle-headed. He is animated by a bitter and suspicious dislike of England, which induces him to regard all her measures through a distorted

\* *Muskingum Legends; with other Sketches and Papers Descriptive of the Young Men of Germany and the Old Boys of America.* By Stephen Powers. Philadelphia: Lippincott & Co. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1871.

† *Handbook for Immigrants to the United States.* Prepared by the American Social Science Association. With Maps. New York: Published for the Association by Hurd & Houghton, the Riverside Press, Cambridge, Mass. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1871.

‡ *Appleton's Handbook of American Travel: Western Tour, embracing Eighteen Through Routes to the West and Far West, Tours of the Great Lakes and Rivers, and all Local Routes of the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Wisconsin, Missouri, &c.; being a complete Guide to the Rocky Mountains, Yosemite Valley, &c., and other Famous Localities; with full Descriptive Sketches of the Cities, Towns, Rivers, Lakes, Waterfalls, Mountains, &c.* With Maps and Diagrams. New York: Appleton & Co. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1871.

§ *Questions of the Day, Economic and Social.* By Dr. William Elder. Philadelphia: Henry Carey Baird, Industrial Publisher. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1871.

\* *The Southern States since the War. 1870-1871.* By Robert Somers. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1871.

† *Words; their History and Derivation, Alphabetically Arranged.* By Dr. F. Ebener and E. M. Greenway, Junior. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1871.

‡ *Odd Hours of a Physician.* By John Darby. Philadelphia: Lippincott & Co. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1871.



medium; and not being restrained by any knowledge of history or any sense of absurdity from following his assumptions to their legitimate conclusions, he actually tells us that our adoption of a Free-Trade policy is simply a pretence, intended to delude others into the reality thereof; and that our Free-Traders sought not the free admission of foreign goods into our own ports and markets, but a means of winning access to foreign markets for our own exports; as if this had not been the view insisted on by Protectionists and Reciprocists, and mercilessly ridiculed by the Manchester school. He is so hopelessly confused as to find in our taxation of tobacco, spirits, and sugar a protective tariff, although he is quite aware that our Excise duties are at least equal to our import duties, and seems to be aware that we tax the raw material at as high an *ad valorem* rate as the finished article. He knows that a protective duty is one whose object is to give an advantage to the home producer over his foreign rival; he knows that when Excise and Customs imposts are equal no such advantage is given; and yet he actually contrives to believe that such equal taxation is protective. By way of proving the absolute bewilderment of his mind on the subject, he compares such equal duties with import duties levied in order to raise the cost of imported articles to a level with the American cost of production. In all this he is so far consistent that his doctrine appears to be that no country should be allowed to import anything but such raw produce as its climate will not allow it to raise for itself; and with equal wisdom he regards the production of exportable staples as a misfortune, if not a crime, and seems half disposed to prohibit the growth of more cotton and tobacco than can be used at home. On the population question he has caught a glimpse of the only possible answer to Malthus—that population increases in a constantly diminishing ratio, fertility being in inverse proportion to material luxury and intellectual culture; but he introduces his own mental vagueness into the matter, and of course utterly fails to discern the hopeless prospect held out to humanity by a theory which implies that the inferior races and classes of mankind must inevitably swallow up the higher and more civilized; that the proportion of intellectual to animal natures tends to diminish in each successive age, after once a certain degree of general culture has been reached. The most interesting and least objectionable part of the book is that which records the achievements of the Rochdale Pioneers and other English co-operators, which is not in any true sense Dr. Elder's.

Among the minor books of the month are an excellent duodecimo edition of Mr. W. Cullen Bryant's poems\*, well printed and got up, with some neat and pretty illustrations; a volume of "Poetry of Reason and Conscience"†, in which poetry and reason are about equally defective, while the domestic tragedy which forms the chief piece, and which, if written in prose, might have reached the level of an ordinary tract, is calculated to move laughter in its actual shape. We have also a wild novel, entitled "Matilda Douglas, whose crudities are excused by the plea that truth is stranger than fiction—as if nonsense were not now and then stranger than either; a Life of Bunyan‡, in which the morbid and introspective element of the great allegorist's nature is made unduly prominent by a writer of the same Puritanic creed, and in which the biography is chiefly employed as the vehicle of religious dogmas and sentiments; a treatise on Hades§, in which the author insists that some at least of the planets are inhabited by glorified spirits; an essay or sermon by a Swedenborgian¶, on the distinctive character of the New Church; and a small work on dentistry and the care of the teeth.\*\* A large and valuable treatise on Analytical Mechanics must††, so far as public interest is concerned, be classed with these. Written expressly for advanced mathematical students at Harvard, it is available only to readers who are familiar, not only with the lower branches of Algebra and Euclid, but with the higher portions of Trigonometry and the Integral Calculus; its object being to treat the problems of mechanics on analytic principles—algebraically, that is, and not geometrically.

\* *Poems.* By William Cullen Bryant, Collected and Arranged by the Author. New York: Appleton & Co. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1871.

† *Poetry of Reason and Conscience: Immortality and Worth of the Soul; Ten Scenes in the Life of a Lady of Fashion; and Miscellaneous Pieces.* By James B. Walker, Author of "Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation," &c. &c. Chicago: Henry A. Sumner. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1871.

‡ *Doings in Maryland; or, Matilda Douglas.* Philadelphia: Lippincott & Co. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1871.

§ *Life of John Bunyan; with Notices of some of his Contemporaries, and Specimens of his Style.* By D. A. Harsha, M.A., Author of "Life of Philip Doddridge, D.D.," &c. &c. Philadelphia: Lippincott & Co. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1871.

¶ *The Resurrection of the Redeemed and Hades.* By James Baggs. Philadelphia: Lippincott & Co. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1871.

\*\* *The Divine Evolution of the Churches; or, the New Church as the Church of Humanity, its Position and Prospects Considered.* By George S. Phillips (Tannary Searle), Author of "A History of Chicago and its Churches," &c. &c. In an Address Delivered before the New Church Congregational Union, Philadelphia, May 31, 1871. Philadelphia: Lippincott & Co. 1871.

†† *The Teeth and How to Save them.* By L. P. Meredith, M.D., D.D.S. Philadelphia: Lippincott & Co. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1871.

††† *A System of Analytical Mechanics.* By Benjamin Peirce, Perkins Professor of Astronomy and Mathematics in Harvard University, and Consulting Astronomer of the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac. New York: D. Van Nostrand. London: Trübner & Co. 1871.

## CAUTION.

Advertisements having appeared offering this Journal and other Newspapers at Half-Price on prepayment, the Public are hereby Cautioned not to enter into any Contract or to send Money for this purpose before making due inquiry as to the respectability of the Advertiser.

## NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

The SATURDAY REVIEW is duly registered for transmission abroad.

The publication of the SATURDAY REVIEW takes place on Saturday mornings, in time for the early trains, and copies may be obtained in the Country, through any Newsagent, on the day of publication.

Nearly all the back Numbers of the SATURDAY REVIEW may be obtained through any Bookseller, or of the Publisher, at the Office, 38 Southampton Street, Strand, W.C., to whom all Communications relating to Advertisements should likewise be addressed.

Now ready, VOLUME XXXI., bound in cloth, price 16s. Cloth Cases for Binding all the Volumes, price 2s. each. Also, Reading Cases, price 2s. 6d. each. May be had at the Office, or through any Bookseller.

## THE SATURDAY REVIEW

OF  
POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d.

## CONTENTS OF No. 839, NOVEMBER 25, 1871:

Irish Disaffection. The Plymouth Election.  
The Crisis in Austria. German Diplomats. Sir Charles Dilke at Leeds.  
Spanish Pleas for Repudiation. Elementary Education in Ireland.  
France. The Conference on the Licence Laws.  
The Love of Fame.  
The Religious Contest in Germany. Names and Titles.  
The British Army of the Future. The Opening of the Swiss Federal Assembly.  
English Charities. Tribunals of Commerce.  
Railways and the Public. The "Cat" Interviewed.  
Reuchlin.  
Essays by a Birmingham Manufacturer. A Shadow of Dante.  
The Sylvestres. Blislow's War for the Rhine Frontier. Chief Justice Lefroy.  
Fletcher on Model Houses. Ought We to Visit Her?  
American Literature.

## CONTENTS OF No. 838, NOVEMBER 18, 1871:

Ireland—The Conservative Party—Parliamentary Prospects in France—The New York Friends—Mr. Scott Russell's Explanation—The French Commercial Treaty—Oxford Undergraduates—Local and Central Authority in Sanitary Administration.  
Scotch Students and Hero-Worship—Freedom of Conscience—Mr. Lowe and the Tomlinists—Balsac's Cousine Betts—Trent—Officers as Clerks—County Court Judges in Wales—A Mistold Story—The Dramatic Completion of "Edwin Drood."  
Poets' Galus—Hotten on Literary Copyright—Miss Yonge's Cameos from English History—A Deceased-Wife's Sister Novel—Miss Meteyard's Group of Englishmen—Samples of Classic Culture—Master John Bull—German Literature.

London: Published at 38 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

## ADVERTISEMENTS.

## CRYSTAL PALACE.—SPECIAL ATTRACTIONS.—NEXT WEEK.

MONDAY, WEDNESDAY, and FRIDAY—Professor HERMANN, the Great Prestidigitator, at 3.  
TUESDAY and THURSDAY—OPERAS in ENGLISH, at 3.

SATURDAY—TENTH SATURDAY CONCERT; FIRST DAY of CAT SHOW; BILLIARD MATCH.

The Fine Arts Courts and Collections, including Picture Gallery (the Works on Sale); the Technological and Natural History Collections; Illustrations of Art, Science, and Nature, and the Gardens and Park always open. Music daily.  
Admission, Monday to Friday, 1s.; Saturday, 2s. 6d.; or by Guinea Season Ticket.

CRYSTAL PALACE.—SECOND NATIONAL CAT SHOW, under the patronage of her Grace the Duchess of Sutherland, the Hon. Lady Cust, Lady Mildred Beresford Hope, Lady Dorothy Nevill, the Hon. Mrs. Henry Walpole, and the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. Saturday, December 2; Monday, December 4. Many arrangements which were necessarily tentative at the first Cat Show have been completed for the second, and a still more remarkable result and opportunity for observation of the wonderful development of race under varying conditions in this country and abroad will be insured. Judges—The Hon. Lady Cust, Lady Mildred Beresford Hope, Lady Dorothy Nevill, Hon. Mrs. Henry Walpole, Rev. J. Cumming Macdonald, Harrison Weir, Esq., Jenner Weir, Esq. Admission on Saturday, 2s. 6d.; Monday, 1s.; both days by Guinea Season Ticket.

DORÉ GALLERY.—GUSTAVE DORÉ, 35 New Bond Street. EXHIBITION of PICTURES (including "CHRISTIAN MARTYRS," "MONASTERY," "TRIUMPH OF CHRISTIANITY," "FRANCESCA DE RIMINI," &c. &c.) Admission, 1s.

THE SOCIETY of PAINTERS in WATER-COLOURS.—The ANNUAL WINTER EXHIBITION of SKETCHES and STUDIES is now OPEN, at their Gallery, 5 Pall Mall East. Ten till Five. Admission, 1s.

ALFRED D. FRIPP, Secretary.

